No. 426165

GIVEN BY

Family of the late Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

See pp. 68-72, 92.

Index.

		Page
Alliance Evangelical ~~Evangelical Alliance~~ & Slavery, letter on,	(Patriot Sept. /46)	40
— — — 5 letters on	(do)	56
— — — Opinions of Press on	(do)	57
— Public Breakfast of at Liverpool	(L. Mercury Sept /46)	58
— (Do)	(Patriot Oct /46)	60
— A. S. Meeting at Norwich	(do)	89
— & Slavery	(do)	97
— & Slavery & Free Church, Meeting at Glasgow	(G. Argus Oct /46)	102
— A. S. League Meeting at Aylesbury	(Patriot Oct /46)	127
— — — at Newcastle	(do)	130
— & Slavery from the Watchman	(do)	133
— — letter on	(do)	133
— Meeting at Stonehaven	(do)	134
— A. S. League Meeting at Aylesbury	(Noncon.st Oct /46)	139
— — — at Newcastle	(do)	141
— — —	(Patriot Oct /46.)	144
— — — at Liverpool	(do)	149
— & Am.n Slavery, Letter on,	(do)	154
— — — f.m A. S. Reporter	(do)	155
— Meeting at Edinburgh	(E. Chronicle Oct /46)	156
— & Am.n Slavery Meeting at Glasgow	(G. Argus Oct /46)	165

Article Editorial, Free Church & Slavery (Universe June /46) — 5
——— A. S. Party in U. S. (Daily News June /46) — 10
——— Slavery in America (Universe Aug. /46) — 18
——— Slavery in U. S. (Bristol Mercury Aug /46) — 19
——— Am.n Slavery (Western Times Sept. /46) — 26
——— Thos. Clarkson — (Patriot Oct /46) — 67
——— Free Church & Slavery (Glasgow Argus Dec. /46) — 175.

Breakfast Public to Fred.k Douglass (Northern Whig Jan /46) — 3
——— of Evangelical Alliance (Liverpool Mercury Sep /46) 56
——— ——— (Patriot Oct /46) — 60
——— to Mess.rs Garrison & Douglass (Glasgow Argus Oct /46) 114
——— to Mess.rs (do) & Thompson (Patriot Oct /46) 148

Brock Rev. W. Speech at Norwich — (Norfolk News Oct /46) — 74
——— Letter from on Rev. M. M. Clarke (Patriot Oct /46) — 86
——— ——— (do) — 99

Clarke Rev. M. M. Letter from to Rev. W. Brock (Norfolk News Oct /46) — 75
——— ——— (Patriot Oct /46) — 86
——— Refutation of Statements of — (do) — 89
——— Speech at Norwich Letters on — (do) — 98
——— Remarks on the letter of — (do) — 131

Clarkson Thos. Death of, Edit.l Article (Patriot Oct/46) — 67
— — Last thoughts of — — (do) — 68
— Last moments of from Globe (do) — 72
— Death of, Edit.l Article (Norfolk News Oct/46) — 73
— — from Ipswich Express — (do) — 73
— — from Times (Patriot Oct/46) — 86

Clowes Rev. T. Speech at Norwich (Norfolk News Oct/46) — 78
— — (Patriot Oct/46) — 89

Cox D. S. F. Speech at Liverpool (L. Mercury Sept/46) — 59
— (Patriot Oct/46) — 61
— Remarks on by G. Thompson (do) — 150

Douglass Frederick, lectures in Belfast (Northern Whig Jan/46) — 1
— Speech at Holywood Abstinence Soc.y — (do) — 1
— Public Breakfast to, at Belfast — (do) — 3
— Speech at 1st Meeting of the A. S. League in London (Universe Aug/46) — 17
— Editorial Article on — (Bristol Mercury Aug/46) — 19
— Speech at Bristol — (do) — 23
— — at Exeter — (Western Times Sept/46) — 31
— — (do) — 33

Douglass Frederick, Speech at Bristol (B. Mercury Sept/46) — 37
——— at Exeter Hall (Patriot Sept/46) — 53
——— at Glasgow (G. Argus Oct/46) — 112
——— Public Breakfast to at Glasgow — (do) ——— 114
——— Speech at Liverpool — (L. Times Oct/46) — 136
——— at Glasgow (Nonconformist Oct/46) — 143
——— at Edinburgh — (E. Chronicle Oct/46) — 156
——— at Bolton — (Bolton Free Press Nov/46) 173
——— at Bristol — (B. Mercury April/47) — 175
——— Voyage to America — (L. Pool Times May/47) — 176

Free Church & Slavery — — (Universe June/46) — 5
——— Address to from B & F. A. S. Soc^y — (do) ——— 7
——— Ev^l. Al^ce & Am^n. Slavery Meeting (Glasgow Argus Oct/46) 102
——— at Glasgow (Noncon. Oct/46) — 143
——— & Am^n. Slavery Edit^l. Article (Glasgow Argus Dec/46) — 175

Garrison, W. L. Speech at 1st. Meeting of A. S. League
in London (Universe Aug/46) — 13
——— Editorial Article on — (do) ——— 18
——— — (Bristol Mercury Aug/46) — 19
——— Speech at Bristol ——— (do) ——— 21

Garrison W. L. Speech at Exeter (Western Times Sept /46) — 27
——— at Exeter Hall (Patriot Sept /46) — 41
——— Letter on — (Belfast News Letter Oct /46) — 99
——— ——— ——— (do) — 100
——— Speech at 1st Meeting of Emancipation Soc^y.
at Glasgow (G. Argus Oct /46) — 103
——— ——— Ladies A. S. Meeting — (do) — 112
——— ——— at 2nd Meeting of Emancipation Soc^y.
at Glasgow (G. Argus Oct /46) — 112
——— Public Breakfast to at Glasgow — (do) — 114
——— Speech at Liverpool (L. Times Oct /46) — 139
——— at Newcastle (Nonconformist Oct /46) — 141
——— (Patriot Oct /46) — 144
——— Public Breakfast to at Glasgow — (do) — 148
——— Speech at Edinburgh — (E. Chronicle Oct /46) — 157
——— ——— at Glasgow — (G. Argus Oct /46) — 166

League A. S. 1st Meeting in London (Universe Aug /46) — 12
——— Meeting at Exeter Hall (Patriot Sept /46) — 40
——— Letter from R. Smith — (Patriot Oct /46) — 85
——— & Eo^l All^c Meeting at Aylesbury — (do) — 127
——— Meeting of Delegates at Liverpool (L. Times Oct /46) — 134
——— & Eo^l All^c Meeting at Aylesbury (Noncon. Oct /46) — 139

Letters from Isaac Nelson (Northern Whig Jan.7/46) — 2
— signed Free Presbyter "Send back the Money"
(Universe June/46) — 6
— Philelutheros on Am.n Slavery (B. Mercury Aug/46) 19
— 3 on A. S. Meetings at Exeter (West.n Times Sept/46) — 34
— signed R. on Ev.l All.c & Slavery (Patriot Sept/46) — 40
— J. Campbell on G. Thompson — (do) — 55
— J. Spence on Ev.l All.c & Xtian Union (do) — 56
— G. Whitefield on — — — (do) — 57
— G. Thompson on Clarkson (Patriot Oct/46) — 68
— R. Smith. W. Brock & M. M. Clarke — (do) — 85
— T. Brightwell & W. Brock on M. M. Clarke — (do) — 98
— T. R. on A. S. League — (do) — 99
— P. D. Hardy on W. L. Garrison (Belfast News Letter Oct/46) 99
— C. on Meeting at Belfast — (do) — 100
— Nomo on Dr. Willis's Overture (Glasgow Argus Oct/46) 116
— P. B. St John on G. Thompson (Gt. West.n Advert.r Oct/46) 126
— W. W. Ewbank on Ev.l All.c & Slavery (Patriot Oct/46) — 133
— Chas. Sabine on — — — (do) — 154
— John Wesley on Am.n Slavery — (do) — 156

Meeting Public on Am.n Slavery at Belfast (Northern Whig Jan/46) — 8
— of A. S. League in London (Universe Aug/46) — 12
— on Am.n Slavery at Bristol (B. Mercury Aug/46) — 20
— — — at Exeter (West.n Times Sept/46) — 26
— — — at Bristol (B. Mercury Sept/46) — 33
— of A. S. League at Exeter Hall (Patriot Sept/46) — 46
— on Am.n Slavery at Norwich (Norfolk News Oct/46) — 74
— A. S. on Ev.l All.e at Norwich (Patriot Oct/46) — 89
— on Am.n Slavery Free Church & Ev.l Alliance
at Glasgow (G. Argus Oct/46) — 102
— Ladies' A. S., at Glasgow — (do) — 111
— of Emancipation Soc.y at Glasgow — (do) — 112
— A. S. League & Ev.l All.e at Aylesbury (Patriot Oct/46) — 127
— — at Liverpool — (L. Times Oct/46) — 134
— — & Ev.l All.e at Aylesbury (Norwich Oct/46) — 139
— Am.n Slavery at Newcastle — (do) — 141
— — at Glasgow — (do) — 143
— — & Ev.l All.e at Newcastle (Patriot Oct/46) — 144
— — — at Liverpool — (do) — 149
— — — at Glasgow — (do) — 156
— — at Edinburgh — (E. Chronicle Oct/46) — 156
— — & Ev.l All.e at Glasgow (G. Argus Oct/46) — 165
— — at Bolton — (B. Free Press Nov/46) — 173
— — at Bristol — (B. Mercury April/47) — 175

Thompson George Speech at 1st Meeting of A. S. League in London (Universe Aug/46) — 12
——— ——— at Exeter Hall (Patriot Sept/46) — 46
——— Letter on ——— (do) ——— 55
——— ——— from ——— (Patriot Oct/46) — 68
——— Speech at Norwich (Norfolk News Oct/46) — 79
——— ——— (Patriot Oct/46) ——— 89
——— Letter on ——— (Gt. West. Advert. Oct/46) — 126
——— Speech at Aylesbury — (Patriot Oct/46) ——— 128
——— ——— at Liverpool (L. Times Oct/46) ——— 134
——— ——— at Aylesbury (Noncon. Oct/46) ——— 140
——— ——— at Newcastle (Patriot Oct/46) ——— 146
——— breakfast to at Newcastle ——— (do) ——— 148
——— Speech at Liverpool ——— (do) ——— 150
——— ——— at Edinburgh ——— (E. Chronicle Oct/46) — 159
——— ——— at Glasgow — (G. Argus Oct/46) ——— 167

Willis N., Overture on Am. Slavery (Glasgow Argus Oct/46) — 116

Wright H. C. Speech at 1st Meeting of A. S. League in London (Universe Aug/46) ——— 12

Family of the late William Lloyd Garrison
Dec. 15. 1895

Northern Whig Jan. 3. 1846

LECTURES ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.—On Thursday and Friday evenings last, Mr. Douglass delivered two lectures on the subject of American slavery, in the Primitive Methodist Chapel, Donegall-place, to crowded audiences. On the latter evening, Mr. Douglass dwelt on the subject of the Annexation of Texas, shewing that the principal object of the Americans was not only extended dominion and property, but the confirming and strengthening the cause of slavery. Mr. Douglass exhibited some of the instruments of torture used by the slave-drivers; and, after an able exposure of the Antichristian system, sat down amid general applause.—On this occasion, the Rev. Dr. Drew filled the Chair, and a number of Clergymen and lay gentlemen appeared on the platform. Eloquent speeches were delivered by the Rev. Isaac Nelson, the Rev. Messrs. Boyd, Hodgen, &c.; also, by Mr. Buffom, an American abolitionist, who has, we understand, promised to advocate the cause of temperance, next Tuesday evening, at the anniversay of the Total Abstinence Society, in the Lancasterian School. At the conclusion, votes of thanks were unanimously given to Mr. Douglass, for his talented advocacy of the cause of the slave; and to the Rev. Isaac Nelson, for his unflinching and valuable labours. The formation of a female Anti-slavery Society was announced. It was stated that Mr. Douglass would re-visit Belfast, if possible, during the next Summer, at the time of the sitting of the General Assembly; that he would be entertained at a public breakfast, on Tuesday morning next, in the Commercial Buildings, and that, on Wednesday evening, he would give a lecture on the subject of temperance, in the Presbyterian Meeting-house, Donegall-street.

N. Whig. Jan. 8. 1846

HOLYWOOD TOTAL ABSTINENCE SOCIETY.—Mr. Frederick Douglass, the fugitive slave, who is the advocate of total abstinence, as well as the abolition of slavery, kindly attended the fourth anniversary *soirée* of this Society, which was held on Wednesday evening, 31st ult. After due honour had been paid to "the cup that cheers, but not inebriates," Dr. M'Kittrick was called to the Chair. Having briefly alluded to the continued interest which the respectable portion of the community takes in the progress of the Society, he shewed the advantage of the tea party, in bringing all classes together for mutual improvement; reminded the ladies of the power of female influence; of their numerously-signed petition to the Queen, on a former occasion, for the abolition of West India slavery, and suggested a remonstrance to the ladies of America, from the Holywood ladies, in the hope that such a movement might become general, and give an impetus to the abolition cause. The Rev. C. J. M'Alester then gave an account of the progress of the Society, during the year. The Chairman said, he would read the sentiment to which Mr. Douglass was to speak, when he would have the pleasure of introducing that talented and eloquent stranger to the company:—"Freedom for the mind and the body,"—may the time speedily arrive, when society shall be released from the drinking customs by which man's best faculties and highest interests are enthralled, and when the word *slave* shall no longer be known in the vocabulary of professing Christians. Mr. Douglass was received with universal and continued applause. In the course of his address, he drew a striking parallel between the power exercised over the slave by his master, and that exercised over the drunkard by his bottle. He also alluded to the indifference of many Ministers to the teetotal cause. He then gave a very gratifying statement of the progress of teetotalism in the New England States, mentioning several in which there was not a rum shop to be found. He attributed his excellent health and ability to undergo the various and important duties in which he was engaged to the practice of teetotalism. He also made some striking statements on slavery. Mr. Buffom, who is also an abolitionist and total abstainer for thirteen years, spoke on the progress and success of the Washingtonians in promoting temperance in America, and also on the subject of American slavery. The Rev. Jacob Alexander, in a powerful and argumentative speech, exposed the absurdity of the old temperance advocates monopolizing the name of Christian temperance, and their inconsistency in denouncing distilled spirit when mixed with pure water, while they continued drinking it themselves, as it was mixed in all the wines used in these countries. The next sentiment was "Education"—by which the humbler classes will be elevated; and all will better understand their duties, and the principles which contribute to the health and happiness of mankind. The Rev. H. Henderson was present, and prepared to speak on this sentiment; but, on account of the lateness of the hour, deferred it till another occasion, to give way to Mr. Mulvenna, who had composed a poetical welcome and address to Mr. Douglass. The next sentiment was, "The philanthropic efforts of the age; and may their happy results be speedily felt in the general improvement of society." Mr. Mulvenna spoke to this sentiment, and, in alluding to the abolition of slavery, delivered, in a very eloquent style, the address above alluded to, which was much applauded. During the evening, several anthems were sung, by a choir instructed on the Hullah system, which teetotalism was the means of introducing into Holywood.—*A Correspondent.*

N. Whig Jan. 8. 1846

2

THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AND *THE BANNER*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN WHIG.

Belfast, 3d January, 1846.

SIR,—*The Banner*, of Tuesday last, contained a charge preferred against me by the Editor, or some one in his name. I offered a reply two days previous to their Friday's publication. It was refused, on the ground that the Editor was in Scotland, and I was required to send him my manuscript. This I declined to do, as I considered it not a little strange that the Editor should be *at home* to publish an attack on me, but *not at home* to receive my reply. You will oblige me by inserting the enclosed, that the public, and especially the readers of *The Banner*, may not be misled by the misrepresentations and garbled statements of that journal.

Yours, ISAAC NELSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BANNER.

Belfast, 31st December, 1845.

SIR,—I regret the necessity imposed upon me of replying to your remarks. With yourself, as an individual, I have had no quarrel, and I seek none; while, at the same time, I am aware, that, in newspaper disputes, the antagonists are apt to forget the main subject, and betake themselves to personalities, and too frequently to abuse. Besides, it appears to be extremely difficult to obtain fair play with your firm. The outer court of *The Banner* Office is so frequently occupied by individuals who are not accountable, and the inner court is so frequently without either presiding genius or attendant spirit, that a writer, in his own defence, scarce knows whom to address. I called yesterday to ascertain whether this reply would appear on Friday or not; I was informed, by two gentlemen, that a note would be sent me at five o'clock. I waited till nine, and none came. I cannot imagine that Mr. Troup, as a gentleman, could be cognizant of such doings. I must suppose you to be misled by others.

You charge me with bearing false witness, in reference to the insertion of the reply to "Civis." The facts are the following:—Two gentlemen went to your office on Monday, a little after one o'clock, and were told, that if they returned at three, an answer would be given, whether it would be inserted next day or not; they returned at the appointed time, and there was no answer, nor any person to give one. At four o'clock, an answer was returned, that the Editor was gone to Scotland, and had taken the manuscript with him. This surprised the gentlemen the more, as they were aware, that, on a former occasion, when you declined to publish a letter from Mr. Standfield, you refused to return the manuscript, and claimed it as your own property.—An intimation, indeed, was given, that it would appear on Friday, if it contained nothing *objectionable*. It is surely hard that the publication of a reply to an attack should be made to depend on the opinion formed of the mode of conducting the defence. The wind and weather conspired to prevent the publication of the unfortunate document on Friday; and yet, some individual, in Belfast ventured (without any authority from the Editor), late on Thursday evening, to offer to publish it, if we would only furnish another copy. This shews, that there is some individual in Belfast, who had power to order its publication, when it was thought prudent so to do. Why was it, then, prudent to publish it? Simply, because we had related these facts to a public meeting, and read a copy of the letter which was supposed to be *snug* in Glasgow? From all these grave doings, concerning a document which could have been read in five minutes, in the cabin of the steam-boat, we came to the conclusion—you did not intend to publish it, at least till it would be of no use. One of the largest and most respectable meetings I ever saw in Belfast, drew the same conclusion; but, it appears we have all been bearing false witness against our neighbour, *The Banner*. This is a sad thing, especially for a Presbyterian Minister. Those, however, who read the above facts, will take the liberty of judging for themselves. I, for one, will continue to hold and express my opinions, without the least fear of *The Banner* before my eyes. If I did not fear God in bearing testimony, I would not fear at all. I assure you, I did not then, nor do I now, feel the least anxiety as to your being one hundred and sixty miles off, or in Donegall-street. I regret that, at present, you are not more at home, and I think I would say nothing of you, while in Glasgow, which I would fear to repeat, face to face. The cause for which I write, and to which I seek to direct public attention, is too sacred to be sullied by false witness; and, alas! too deeply tragic in itself to need the aid of false colouring. It is the cause of the slave, the cause of Christianity, and of God. At the same time, as you seem inclined to dip your pen in gall, I beg to say, that I do not much mind abuse, nor am I usually terrified by gasconade.—Ever since the Free Church took a step in reference to slavery, and some Ministers in Belfast adopted a certain cautious policy in this great question, you have been constantly finding fault with the Anti-Slavery Committee. It is now full time to have done with all these charges of indiscretion, imprudence, and so forth, applied to the Society. Tell us, like a man and a Christian, what are our faults, either as a Society, or as individuals—if I am faulty, I will confess it—if I have ever used an over-strong expression, publish it, in capital letters, in *The Banner*, and if you will give me room in your columns, I will own it. I say this, because I am now about to lay down some propositions which may startle "Civis," and I prefer to deal with him rather than you, as he is understood to be a profound theologian. I have loved the Free Church as the Church of my fathers—as the asylum of spiritual freedom; yet truth compels me to make the following statements:—

First, I believe the arguments used by Dr. Cunningham, before the Presbytery of Edinburgh, to induce the Presbytery to receive American slave-holders into communion, were both unscriptural and injurious to Christianity, though said by him to be based upon the Word of God.

Secondly, the decision come to by the late Assembly of the Free Church, in May last, on the same subject of fellowship with slaveholders, I believe to be a miserable piece of metaphysical sophistry, in which a distinction is made between slaveholding and holding men as chattel property—a distinction without a difference.

Thirdly, the Free Church is bound, in duty, to return the money, and blot from her minutes that decision which has earned and received the thanks of the slaveholding party in America.

Will "Civis" be honest and candid enough to tell us his name, along with a list of the indiscretions of the Belfast Anti-Slavery Committee, and take up each or all of the foregoing propositions; either in your columns or in any way he may think proper, and then let the public judge. This would be a much nobler course than that adopted in your paper. I charge you not only with having misrepresented and garbled the eloquent lectures of Frederick Douglass, but with having contributed to swell the torrent of abuse with which a stranger and a fugitive was met on his arrival among *Christians*.

What reliance is to be placed on your statements, as a journalist, may be inferred from the following, out of many such.—You represent me, at one of the meetings, as volunteering, or presenting myself, to read the reply to "Civis," whereas you must know that I was called on by the Secretary so to do; and, when a contemporary, whom you led into the error, corrected his mistake, you had not the candour to do the same. A short time ago, you promised the publication of two letters on the late Anti-Slavery meetings. Only one has appeared; what has become of the other? is it unfit for publication? I have good reason, moreover, to believe you still keep back a most important letter from America, on the same subject of slavery. If you be a friend to the Anti-Slavery cause, *you* certainly are a discreet one.—Again, you represent James Gibson, Esq., as rebuking Frederick Douglass. Would your readers believe, that, on the same night, and as Chairman of the same meeting, Mr. Gibson delivered one of the most animated and eloquent speeches he ever made in Belfast, expressing his hope in God, and his earnest prayer, that the Free Church would give back the money and refuse fellowship to slaveholders. If your readers form their ideas of the present state of public opinion, from what you write, they will be far from the truth. John Clarke, Esq., whose father's memory is dear to the inhabitants of Belfast, and who is beloved and respected for his own character, by all who knew him, could not escape being told by you, that he was lamentably ignorant, because he would not let your Reporter *speak* at the meeting, to make up for his *not* reporting. One of our late Ministers in Belfast, called you an Ishmaelite against every man, and, really, if you persist in such a course, you will deserve to be called the "*Wasp*" *of Ulster*, rather than *The Banner of Ulster*.

Your charge against the Society of slandering the Free Church, and your abuse of me, were intended for no other purpose, I suspect, but to shield "Civis" from a fair, manly, and minute examination of the whole subject. You will not, however, succeed. The public expects him to come out in his real name, and shew that the Free Church has not sinned deeply in the late decision. I desire to see the imputation wiped from her character, which, I think, can only be done by rescinding the decision, and returning the money. If "Civis" can shew a more effectual, prudent, and christian method of accomplishing this, we will humbly follow in his wake, and assist him by our efforts.—I am, Sir, yours, &c., ISAAC NELSON.

N. Whig Jan. 8. 1846

PUBLIC BREAKFAST TO MR. FRED. DOUGLASS, THE FUGITIVE SLAVE.

On Tuesday morning last, at ten o'clock, a public breakfast was given, in the large room of the Commercial Buildings, to Mr. Frederick Douglass, the fugitive slave, whose lectures, in Belfast, have excited a considerable degree of interest. More than two hundred persons sat down to a most substantial breakfast, which was supplied by Mr. Hall, of the Commercial Hotel. Among the individuals present, there were the following :—Wm. S. Crawford, Esq., M.P., Rev. Isaac Nelson, Rev. Mr. Buffon, Rev. Mr. Boyd, Rev. Mr. Hodgens, Rev. Mr. M'Alester, Holywood; Rev. Jacob Alexander, Derry; Dr. Thompson, Roselands; Dr. Aikin, Dr. Thomas Thompson, Messrs. Robert Blackwell, Thomson Tennent, John Boyd, James M'Tear, James Gibson, James Blair, Samuel Vance, Edwin Blow, George Pim, R. Neill, J. Standfield, A. F. Calder, T. Hardy, Captain Hardcastle, Freeman Hardy, Robert Workman, J. M'Conkey, R. Boag, J. Workman, J. Workman, jun., T. Tripp, J. Henderson, York-street; John Owden, William Valentine, C. Duffin, D. M'Connell, J. Arnold, Maxwell Sanders, J. M'Vicker, S. Edgar, Wm. M'Peake, Ballymena; J. Girdwood, J. Gray, J. Marshall, Wm. Webb, J. Lamb, J. C. Trotter, James Ireland, Alexander Robb, J. B. Ferguson, &c., &c.

A blessing was asked by the Rev. Mr. Nelson, and thanks were returned by the Rev. Mr. Hodgens.

Wm. Sharman Crawford, Esq., M.P., was then called to the Chair.

Mr. Crawford said, he felt proud of the honour which the meeting had conferred upon him, in placing him in the position of their Chairman, on such an occasion as the present. When the Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society called on him to preside, he felt that there were no services he could render, that would be more especially his duty. (Cheers.) He considered, that there were two objects in that meeting :—Their first object was, to do honour to the gentleman on his left hand, and to give him the meed of their kindness for his exertions in the cause of humanity, and in the cause of the abolition of the nefarious system of slavery. (Hear.) They wished to do honour to a man that had been a slave; but who now, he was proud to say, was no longer a slave. (Cheers.) It was one of the most glorious principles of the British Constitution, that, when a man set his foot on British soil, no other man could claim a property in him; no slave-hunter could come on the soil of England, and claim a fugitive slave. (Cheers.) Such, he said, was one of the most glorious principles of the Constitution of Great Britain; and that gentleman, as long as he continued under the protection of Britain, had all the qualifications of a freeman. (Hear, and cheers.) There was another object, in their present meeting, infinitely more important than the first. It was, to denounce, by the power of their voice, the practice of all those countries which continued to permit slavery to exist within them; but, more especially, to denounce the conduct of any country which professed to have a Constitution founded on the rights of the people—which professed the principles of democracy, and yet kept up a system of slavery, by which a great portion of their fellow-creatures were deprived of all civil and religious rights whatever. (Loud cheers.) It was sufficiently bad, in those States that were governed by arbitrary authority, to maintain the system of slavery; but it was doubly bad—it was tenfold worse—in a State professing democratic principles. (Hear.) As a Member of the British Legislature he could not stand before them, and not, as the Representative of a constituency by which he was bound to have a consideration for the rights of the people, denounce any country that maintained such principles. (Hear, hear, hear, and loud cheers.) It occurred to him, that it might be desirable to record the principles of the American Constitution; and, by doing so, to shew them how discordant those principles were with their actions. He should read them the heading of the declaration of American independence, of the 17th September, '87. It commenced with this first paragraph :—"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish," &c. That was part of the declaration by which the people of the United States professed to carry out their Constitution; and now they gave the lie to that declaration, when they maintained the practice of slavery. (Cheers.) They said they wanted to establish justice: was their system of slavery compatible with justice? Was it just that they should have an unfortunate race of men within their bonds, from whom the principles of justice were withheld, and all the rights and protection of the laws? (Hear, hear.) It was a most remarkable proof of the debasing nature of those laws which governed that country, that they would let a white man be protected for crime against a black man. A black man, by those laws, could not be a witness against him; and the consequence was, that the slaveholder could commit whatever outrage he chose against his slave. There might be none present but his slaves at the commission of the outrage; and, no matter what the outrage, that iniquitous law of which he spoke would screen the white man. Was such a law as that consistent with the principles of justice professed by the American States? (Hear, hear.) They wanted to secure the tranquillity of the country; but how could they expect tranquillity to be ensured, when they had the great mass of the population put away from the benefit of the laws? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) They said they wanted to secure their welfare; now, did they do so? (Hear, hear.) He would call their attention to the words of a distinguished writer, De Togneville, who, in his *Democracy in America*, vol. 11, page 329, says,—"The traveller who floats down the current of the Ohio may be said to sail between liberty and servitude—upon the left bank of the stream the population is rare—some troops of slaves loitering in the half desert fields—the primeval forest recurs at every turn—society seems asleep—man to be idle—nature alone offers a scene of activity and life. From the right bank, on the contrary, a confused hum is heard, which proclaims the presence of industry; the fields are covered with abundant harvests; the elegance of the houses announces the taste and activity of the labourer, and man appears to be in the enjoyment of that wealth and contentment, which is the reward of labour." Such was the contrast which that very distinguished writer drew between the condition of the slave and the freeman. (Loud cheers.) Now, they said, that they wanted to establish liberty; but, how could they assert that they established liberty, so long as the slave system was maintained? How could there be anything approaching to liberty, in a country where man held property in man—where the slaveholder held such a power over his fellow-creature, as that he could commit, with impunity, against him, any outrage—when he could lash him, and torture him, and when he could even shoot him, without the fear of being brought to an account for his actions? Was that not giving the lie to every profession they made of the principles of liberty? Should they not be reminded of the principles of liberty by which they professed to be guided, and shewn how far they departed from them? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The slaves were put in the position of a chattel—they were accountable beings, and yet they were made only accountable to their masters, and not to God, for their actions and conduct. (Hear.) They were, in fact, treated as brutes among men. Every principle of social life was violated—the members of the same family were sent away, never to see each other again; and was not that a condition of things that every man, and that every Christian, should hold up his hands, and exclaim against. (Hear.) It was still more extraordinary to him, that any persons, who professed to be friends of religious principles, either as laymen or Clergymen, could tolerate or justify such a system as that of slavery. (Loud cheers.) He would ask, how any

Clergyman could go into the pulpit, and read the doctrines of Christ, and avoid denouncing, as an iniquity, the system of slavery. (Hear, hear.) Could it be maintained, that the blacks were a race not entitled to the favour of the Almighty? Would they maintain that the Almighty made distinctions between the black race and the white? Surely, such a principle could not be maintained by any who professed to be guided by the principles of Christianity. He would refer such persons to the words of the Scriptures themselves. Peter, in the Acts of the Apostles, says,—"God has shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean—of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but, in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."—Let the white men not attempt to treat the black men as if they were not their equals. Let them learn a lesson from the gentleman beside him. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) He asked, was not the black man fit to stand on an equality with the white? (Renewed cheering.) There was one in his own person, a proof to them and to the world, that when the black man was placed under circumstances in which his energies could be called forth, he could be placed on a par with white men, and rank superior to many. (Great cheering.) Could any Clergyman go into the pulpit, and repeat that beautiful production of the Lord's prayer, and continue the practices that were the usual mode of proceeding towards the slave? How could he, who mercilessly lashed his slave, whether guilty of offence or not, repeat that particular precept—"Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us?" (Hear.) Was not the man who flogged his slave, and made that prayer, calling down the curses of God upon himself? (Loud cheers.) How could he read the injunction, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," and continue the slave system? (Renewed cheering.) Such appeared to him to be the astonishing inconsistencies of the of the people of America, both as regarded their political and religious opinions. But, why should they not have adopted the British principle? It was because, before their Constitution was established, slavery had existed in the American States; and that proved to them how man was corrupted by being permitted to hold irresponsible power. He must say, with grief, that the slaveholders of America tended to give grounds for the allegations which had been made against democracy—that the people, when they held irresponsible power, were the greatest tyrants on the earth. (Cheers.) Every one there knew that he (Mr. S. Crawford) was the friend of democratic principles, as far as they could be made consistent with monarchical government. But he would not, on that account, screen those who were democrats, and who acted against the principles of democracy. There never was any country that did such injury to the principles of democracy as America did by her support of the slave trade. (Cheers.) As an honest supporter of democratic principles, he felt it his duty to denounce them, in the strongest terms his voice could utter. It was the greatest bulwark of slavery, and gave countenance to other countries, in upholding that system. (Hear.) As long as the slave system was kept up, there would ever be a slave trade. As long as there was a slave market, there would be a slave trade—as long as there was money to be got by them, there would be slaves. It was their duty to reprobate the system, in every way in their power—to try, by raising up their voices against them, to induce those countries which continued the slave system to abolish it. (Hear, hear.)—There was no other way by which the sufferings of the slave could be remedied—no other way than by raising the moral power of the public mind against it. If the Americans were deaf to the Bible, to the suggestions of the spirit of liberty and religion, it was their duty to try to shame them out of the system—to let them know that they were reprobated by Christian men. (Loud cheers.) He trusted that the voice of that assembly might pass over the Atlantic, and reach some of those States that kept up the iniquitous practice. A voice from Ireland had reached those States, and they felt sore at the castigaton they had received. (Cheers.) Let them hope that, even from that humble meeting, a voice might reach them, and that they might know that that great and respectable portion of the town of Belfast, which he saw before him, reprobated their conduct, and demanded the freedom of the slave. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He (Mr. S. Crawford) had now endeavoured briefly to state to them his views and feelings; and he trusted, that he had not altogether been an insufficient expositor of the views entertained by themselves. (Cheers.) He should not now detain them longer from the particular object of the meeting, which was to do honour to their guest on his left. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

The Rev. Mr. Nelson then rose; and, after a few introductory observations, read an address to Mr. Douglass, and presented him with a beautifully gilt Bible, in rich binding, bearing the following inscription:—"Presented, by the Belfast Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to Mr. Frederick Douglass, a fugitive slave, from the United States of America, in testimony of their admiration of the several eloquent lectures which he delivered, in Belfast, on American slavery, in December, 1845, and, also, as a tribute of respect and esteem for his personal character. The Committee hope that he may be long enabled, in the strength of the Lord, to persevere in the noble cause in which he is engaged; and, by the torch of Divine truth, to expose all who attempt to defend or palliate slavery. When far separated, they trust, that the possession of this Bible will remind him, that, in Belfast, there are many who sympathise with those who are in bonds, and who are, also, the personal friends and well-wishers of Mr. Frederick Douglass. Signed, by order, and in behalf of the Committee, James Standfield, F. A. Calder, Honorary Secretaries. Belfast, 6th January, 1846."

Mr. Douglass then said—It would be useless for me to attempt to conceal my embarrassment, in rising to respond to the eloquent and highly complimentary address, together with the golden gift with which I have just been presented, by the Belfast Anti-Slavery Society. (Cheers.) I am unequal to the work; my feelings are too deep, too strong, too big for easy utterance. I have often, in the course of my short, though not uneventful life, been called on to respond, in accents of warm and heartfelt gratitude, for noble deeds and generous favours conferred upon me, by the magnanimous friends of my long-enslaved and deeply outraged fellow-countrymen, but never have I been more at a loss for language to fulfil that duty, than on the present thrilling and interesting occasion. (Applause.) The incidents of this morning will form a period in my humble history—a period to which, with all my hopes and aspirations, I never looked forward; but one to which, while memory holds its place, I shall ever look back with the most grateful emotion. I accept, thankfully, this Bible; and, while it shall have the best place in my house, I trust, also, to give its precepts the best place in my heart. (Loud applause.) The happy incidents of this morning have called into remembrance some of my early struggles after knowledge, and the difficulties that then lay in the way of its attainment. I remember the first time I ever heard the Bible read; and I tell you the truth, when I tell you, that from that time, I trace my first desire to learn to read. I was over seven years old; my master had gone out one Sunday night, the children had gone to bed, I had crawled under the centre table, and had fallen asleep, when my mistress commenced to read the Bible, so loud that she waked me—she waked me to sleep no more! I learned that the chapter which she then read was the 1st chapter of Job. I remember my sympathy for the good old man; and my great anxiety to know more about him led me to ask my mistress—who was, at this time, a kind lady—to teach me to read. She commenced, and would have, but for the opposition of her husband, taught me to read. She ceased to instruct me; but

N. Whig Jan 8. 1846

my desire to read continued, and, instead of decreasing, increased; and, by the aid of little boys, obtained at different times, I finally succeeded in learning to read. (Applause.)—After learning to read, my desire for books was equal to my early desire to learn how to read. I have frequently, with my fingers, from the mud and filth of the gutter, raked leaves of the Sacred Volume. These I have washed and dried, and read the words of heavenly wisdom which they contained with a glad heart, considering myself fortunate to enjoy such a privilege. I trust I shall not be deemed presumptuous or egotistical when I say, that, from my present position, I see points in my humble history marked by the finger of God. (Cheers.) Twenty years ago, while lying, not unlike a pet dog, at the feet of my mistress, in her house, in Philpot-street, Fell's-point, Baltimore, I was roused from the sweet sleep of childhood, to hear the narrative of Job. A few years afterwards found me searching for the Scriptures in the muddy street gutters, and rescuing its pages from the filth into which neglect and wastefulness had plunged them. A few years later, I escaped from my chains, gained partial freedom, and became an advocate for the emancipation of my race. A suspicion arose that I was not what I profess to be; to silence which, it is necessary to write out my experience in slavery, and give the names of my enslavers. This endangers my liberty. Persecuted, hunted, and outraged in America, I have come to England, and behold the change! The chattel becomes a man. I breathe, and I am free. (Applause.) Instead of calling the Scriptures from the mud, they come to me dressed in polished gold, as the free and unsolicited gift of devoted friends. (Applause.) I will take it, and while I live, preserve it; and long after I have gone hence to my reward, if my will is carried out, it shall be preserved by my children, and remain a memento in the house of Douglass, till time shall melt it into dust. (Applause.) I assure you, gentlemen of the Committee, you have selected a proper mode of expressing your regard for me. What could be better than the Bible to me, contending against oppression, fraud, and wrong? (Applause.) It is full of wisdom and goodness—faith, hope, and charity, sparkle on every page, all of which deal death to slavery. An attempt has been made to press the Bible into the service of slavery. The abolition party, in America, find no more determined opponents of the cause which they advocate, than the expounders of the Word of God. That, to this audience, might appear strange; but such is the fact. I thank God that a change for the better is taking place; a purer and a higher grade of men are finding their way into the Ministry, and brighter days are beginning to dawn upon my country. You could not have given to me a token so appropriate as this Bible. It contains all that is right, and is opposed to all that is wrong. It knows no one by the colour of his skin. (Applause.) It treats all alike; and says to all, "Whatever you would that men should do unto you, do you so unto them." If you claim liberty for yourself, then grant it to your neighbour, is the doctrine it inculcates. I feel much struck with the change in my circumstances; only a few months ago, I was in a land where I was hated and abhorred—where the bloodhound might have been put on my track, and I have been hunted down and carried back into slavery. I left that land, and in eleven and a-half days I set my foot on British soil, and was free. (Applause.) I now find myself surrounded by kind friends, the very expression of whose countenance beams with sympathy, such as I never expected to meet with, and which has quite overcome and unmanned me. (Cheers.) I could expose slavery in the midst of those who would uphold it—I could contend for the great principles of liberty in the face of the most determined opposition but I am not equal to address those whose sympathy ha been excited for my race, and who have shewed me so much kindness. (Applause.) I will always remember the people of Belfast, and the kind friends I now see around me; and wherever else I feel myself to be a stranger, I will remember I have a home in Belfast. (Applause.) I will look forward with pleasure to the day which will find me among you again—(cheers)—and, in the mean time, you shall hear from me, wherever my lot may be cast. (Applause.) Let me thank you, with my whole heart, for the address and the beautiful present you have made me, as well as for the deep interest you have taken in the cause of the wronged and oppressed slaves of America. You have discharged your duty nobly, and as Christians should do. When I came a stranger among you, I was taken by the hand; and, I may say, my hand has been held throughout. The Committee have laboured, in season and out of season, to give effect to my feeble efforts for the emancipation of my race. Without the Committee I could have done nothing; to them all the praise is due. Once more, accept my thanks for all the kindness I have experienced at your hands; and I bid you all farewell, until I shall meet you again in July.—(Loud cheers.)

The meeting was afterwards addressed by Mr. STANDFIELD, Rev. Mr. NELSON, and others.

The Rev. Mr. NELSON moved, that a number of ladies, with power to add to their number, should form a Belfast Auxiliary Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society.

Universe June 2. 1846

THE FREE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

We are anxious to conduct this journal in a spirit of fairness and impartiality. It is the advocate of principles, and not the organ of parties; and, if we ever do an act of injustice to any man, or body of men, we shall do violence to our deep and settled convictions. We refer to another page of our present number, as an illustration of the impartiality with which we intend to act. The reader will find an able and eloquent appeal to the Free Church of Scotland from the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. That document contains a graphic sketch of the injustice and cruelty of American slavery, coupled with which is an emphatic demand, that the Free Church will "Send back the money" which its delegates to America received from churches in the slave-holding states.

With equal readiness have we allowed a gifted advocate of the Free Church to state his opinion, and to defend that community from the charge of aiding and abetting slavery. His argument is, to a considerable extent, of the *ad hominem* class; and we could have wished, that he had examined more closely the principle involved in the act of holding fellowship with pro-slavery churches. We had fully resolved to deliver our own opinion; but as the General Assembly of the Free Church only entered on this question on Saturday last, and we are yet ignorant of their decision, we deem it more generous, and more just, to defer our remarks until we shall have their deliverance before us.

Original Correspondence.

"SEND BACK THE MONEY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE UNIVERSE.

Sir,—Knowing that your motto is "Justice to all," and that your journal has a very extensive circulation among the serious of all denominations, I take the liberty of using your name to lay before the public a few observations on a subject of considerable importance.

Of late, certain extreme men (*i. e.*, extremely beyond discretion) have raised an outcry against the Free Church because, as they say, she has received 3,000*l.* from the man-stealers of America. In a public meeting held the other day in Edinburgh, they declared that the Free Church "has taken the side of the slave holder against the slave;" and that the most benevolent of men, Dr. Chalmers, deserves to have the whip applied to his back. I may remark that, owing to the matter and the manner of their statements, the opinion of the Free Church is "that an enemy hath done this."

But whether enmity be the mainspring of the proceedings, or simply zeal without knowledge, this cry of "send back the money" is apt to throw a stigma on the Free Church, as if she were nothing less than art and part in the sin of slave dealing. And this ear-catching cry is the more readily received by the ignorant because, to tell the truth, the Free Church has not, like these extreme men, made broad her phylacteries in this matter; but has been content with merely quietly doing her duty—as is known to all who have taken the trouble to inquire.

Believing this to be a question of principle, and not of mere feeling, I object to the use of strong epithets only calculated to excite prejudice by appealing to the imagination. For instance, our opponents call slave holders man-stealers; and then ask, "How can a Christian church hold communion with man-stealers?" How easy it would be to retort this sort of argument upon themselves—thus, they are unquestionably sinners; sinners are contemners of God's law; and "How can a Christian church hold communion with God-contemners?" But the mode is absurd. The question simply resolves itself into this—Are there circumstances in which a man holding slaves may be a Christian? If there are, surely no Christian church has a right to refuse him who has been accepted of Christ. If there are not, then George Whitfield was a reprobate; and all the churches in Britain have, in this respect, been as guilty as the Free Church—for before our own Emancipation Bill they all held fellowship with slave holders; and some of them have even thankfully received money—"the price of blood," forsooth!—from the American churches, as the Rev. Dr. Cox, for one, can testify.

So opposed is the Free Church to the sentiments impudently assigned her by these men, that the last General Assembly declared that there can be "no question as to the heinous sin involved in the institution of American slavery." "National guilt" attaches to "the accursed system," &c. "Neither can there be any doubt as to the duty incumbent on all American Christians to exert themselves to the utmost in every competent way for the purpose of having it abolished." At the same time the Free Church knows there are circumstances in which the slave holder must continue as he is,—such circumstances as are thus alluded to in *Reed and Matheson's Visit to the American Churches*:—"Many, very many with whom I met, would willingly have released their slaves, but the law requires that in that case they should leave the state; and this would mostly be not to improve their condition, but to banish them from their homes and make them miserable outcasts." In all circumstances, however, the Free Church takes most decidedly the part of the slave. In her deliverance on the subject, she says that it is "sin of the deepest die" "to regard or treat" slaves as *chattels personal;* and that "whosoever commits that sin in any sense, or deals otherwise with his slaves than as a Christian man ought to deal with his fellow-man, whatever power the law may give him over them, ought to be held disqualified for Christian communion."

Dr. Cunningham gives a case of a minister who bought a slave in the following circumstances:—A woman had been converted under his ministry; she was about to be sold into a distant part of the country where she would be cut off from church ordinances, and compelled to live in a manner obnoxious to Christianity; she again and again petitioned the minister to buy her, and at last he consented, much as his feelings were against his becoming a slave holder. Now, was this man a reprobate because he bought the woman he had been instrumental in converting, in order that she might be confirmed through one of the appointed means of grace? And, if the man must be excommunicated for so doing, what church shall dare to throw the first stone? But perhaps it may be objected that this is not a case in point, as the woman became his slave of her own free will! But, if slavery be a sin, I cannot see how it can become less a sin because two parties consent to it instead of one.

The Free Church believes that the mere foreign condemnation of American slavery can never become its cure. Foreign agitation may do anything but advance the cause it espouses, for the slave holder naturally makes it a plea for strengthening the bonds of the slavery which it threatens to break. The real cure must come from within. The little leaven already in the slave states must be set a working. It is this leaven that the Free Church is endeavouring to stir up for its pure work, not by the loud out-

Universe June 2. 1846

cry of a hostile opposition, but by the encouraging and strengthening interchange of Christian fellowship and fraternal council. The Free Church loves the slave; and would admit none to communion who is not doing his utmost to neutralize and abolish the slave law.

Still, it may be said, indulge church fellowship if you will, but why take money from actual slave holders? The answer is evident—Because if these slave holders are men of God, how dare we deny them their covenanted right of promoting the great work of God? If it can be proved that they are not men of God, we will have nothing to do with them; but if they are the children of God, by whose authority shall we deprive them of one of the highest privileges of his children? The Free Church did not leave her endowments to hold her hand across the Atlantic for the sake of 3,000*l.* She can collect a million sterling at home in three years. She held out her hand to the American churches in Christian greeting, that, so clasped together, they might help on and incite each other. The intercourse that brought the 3,000*l.* to the Free Church has benefited her, but doubtless it has benefited the native churches still more. "It is more blessed to give than receive." The Free Church has herself experienced that the times of inward revival are also the times of outward bestowal; and, doing to others as she would be done by, she solicited the American churches to assist in the erection of a pure church, that the work of love might incite them also to become more pure; no one ever thinks so seriously of his own wounds as when pouring oil into those of another. It is by a blessing on such Christian intercourse that the Free Church hopes to help the cause of liberty. Her wish is to benefit the slave by spiritualizing the church,—to clasp the hand that she would draw from the chain. And, if in so doing, she is exposed to the sneers of the worldling, and other obloquy, she must just remember that even her Divine Master, for whom she rose and left all, because He took the best course for promoting His Father's work, was called, by the extreme men of that day, a wine-bibber, a glutton, and a partaker with publicans and sinners.

But this cry of "send back the money" throws a stigma on more than the Free Church; for it follows, as clearly as a donkey's tail does a donkey's head, that if it is a sin to have dealings with the slave holder whereby the Free Church is promoted, it is still a greater sin to have dealings with the slave holder whereby slavery is promoted. Now this is what, in effect, every man, woman, and child has, since the days of Nimrod, been doing—by consuming slave produce. They have, in fact, for their own selfish creature comforts, been producing the very stream that has turned the slave mill. If they have not barefacedly stolen the man, they have, at least, thickheadedly given their money to buy the slave. In short, if the proposition is, that it is bad to receive slave-produced money, the corollary is, that it is much worse to give slave-buying money.

It seems, then, that we are all slave holders without knowing it,—that is to say, we receive the benefit of the slave, though we hire an American nominally to hold the whip! In such circumstances, one might wonder where our extreme men find a church pure enough for their fellowship, were the melancholy conviction not forced on us, that these, so violently strict, disciplinarians, if consistent, never can communicate at all—for, as I am credibly informed, they themselves wear shirts, eat sugar, and use tobacco, —accomplices of slave holders,—art and part with man-stealers,—guilty in the third degree,—at least one degree more than the Free Church, which they so recklessly calumniate.

Oh! that we had no beams in our eyes! Oh! that extreme men would remember that he who rashly rides his hobby may chance to break his own neck!

Begging pardon for these desultory remarks,

I remain, &c.,

FREE PRESBYTER.

Universe June 2. 1846

American Slavery.

Address of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the Moderator, Office-bearers, and Members of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland.

Gentlemen,—It is not in the spirit of hostility, or even of controversy, that the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society venture to address you on the subject of American slavery in relation to the American churches; but feeling, as they do, that it involves the liberty and happiness of nearly three millions of human beings, they are anxious to submit to you certain points which, in their judgment, are of great weight, and which they respectfully and earnestly commend to your grave consideration.

The origin of slavery in the United States is not lost in the obscurity of by-gone ages. It is a plain historical fact, that it owes its birth to the African slave-trade, now pronounced by every civilized community the greatest crime ever perpetrated against humanity. By the laws of Great Britain and the United States, that traffic is declared to be felony and piracy, and in the latter country pronounced to be worthy of death. Such was the origin of American slavery. And how is it perpetuated? By laws which yield not in their atrocity and wickedness to the original act which tore the Africans from their native homes, and doomed them to perpetual slavery on a foreign shore. By these laws slaves are not ranked among sentient beings, but among things; they are declared to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners to all intents and purposes, and constructions whatsoever. Such is the cardinal principle of slavery. Its legal incidents as set forth by Judge Stroud, in his sketch of the slave laws of the United States, are as follows:—

"The master may determine the kind, and degree, and time of labour, to which the slave shall be subjected. The master may supply the slave with such food and clothing only, both as to quality and quantity, as he may think proper or find convenient. The master may, at his discretion, inflict any punishment upon the person of his slave. All the power of the master over his slave may be exercised not by himself only in person, but by any one whom he may depute as his agent. Slaves have no legal rights of property in things real or personal; but whatever they may acquire belongs, in point of law, to their masters. The slave being a personal chattel is at all times liable to be sold absolutely, or mortgaged, or leased at the will of his master. He may also be sold by process of law for the satisfaction of the debts of a living, or the debts and bequests of a deceased master at the suit of creditors or legatees. A slave cannot be a party before a judicial tribunal, in any species of action, against his master, no matter how atrocious may have been the injury received from him. Slaves cannot redeem themselves, nor obtain a change of masters, though cruel treatment may have made such change necessary for their personal safety. Slaves being objects of property, if injured by third persons, their owners may bring suit, and recover damages, for the injury. Slaves can make no contract." And to crown the whole, slavery is declared to be "hereditary and perpetual." It is not deemed sufficient to hold the innocent parents in bondage, but these laws, which violate every principle of justice, humanity, and religion, remorselessly consign their innocent offspring to the same state of degradation and sorrow.

"Such," to use the language of Judge Jay, "is American slavery—a system which classes with the beasts of the field—over whom dominion has been given to man—an intelligent and accountable being, the instant his Creator has breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Over this infant heir to immortality no mother has a right to watch—no father may guide his feeble steps, check his wayward appetites, and train him for future usefulness, happiness, and glory. Torn from his parents and sold in the market, he soon finds himself labouring amongst strangers, under the whip of a driver, and his take augmenting with his ripening strength. Day after day, and year after year, he is driven to the cotton or sugar field, as the ox to the furrow. No hope of reward lightens his toil—the subject of insult, the victim of brutality, the laws of his country afford him no redress; his wife, such only in name, may at any moment be dragged from his side; his children, heirs only of his misery and degradation, are but articles of merchandise; his mind, stupified by his oppressor, is wrapped in darkness; his soul, no man careth for it; his body, worn with stripes and toil, is at length committed to the earth like the brute that perisheth."

In practice, the system of American slavery presents the most revolting features. To detail them would require a volume. The Committee would direct attention to a few of them only, by way of example.

Connected with American slavery, as you are probably aware, there is a vast internal slave traffic carried on between what are technically called the slave-breeding and the slave-consuming states. The victims of this odious trade are variously estimated at from 30,000 to 90,000 per annum. Taking the lowest estimate, the Committee would ask who can sum up the amount of guilt contracted by the traders on the one hand, and of suffering endured by the victims on the other? Neither can be computed. But, gentlemen, this inter-state slave-trade derives its chief supplies from the abhorred practice of rearing slaves, as cattle are reared, for the market. In some of the older states it is carried on professionally, and all means are employed to render it productive. The basest passions are elevated to the character of a pursuit. Compulsory unions are made by the proprietors of slaves; and if they prove unproductive, they are broken up without regard for decency or feeling. It is impossible, however, to refer with minuteness to the practices which prevail; it is sufficient to state, that the whole system is an outrage on religion and morals.

Another feature of American slavery is, that it practically dooms the great mass of the slave population to ignorance and vice. The severity of the laws against the instruction of slaves finds its commentary in the measures adopted by slaveholders to prevent the light of knowledge from penetrating their minds. Hence we find a heathen population in the midst of a country which boasts of its religious institutions. From them the Bible is systematically withheld. The great mass of them are destitute of the Gospel, and ever will be under the present state of things. These are not mere assertions; they are admitted facts by all who have any knowledge of the slave states, their laws, and their practices.

In 1833, a committee of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, to whom was referred the subject of the religious instruction of the coloured population, made a report which has been published, and in which this language is used:—

"Who would credit it, that in thsse days of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian republic, there are over 2,000,000 of human beings in the condition of heathen, and, in some respects, in a worse condition. From long-continued and close observation, we believe that their moral and religious condition is such that they may justly be considered the heathen of this Christian country, and will bear comparison with heathen in any country in the world. The negroes are destitute of the Gospel, and ever will be under the present state of things. In the vast field extending from an entire state beyond the Potomac to the Sabine river, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not 12 men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes. In the present state of feelings in the south, a ministry of their own colour could neither be obtain no tolerated.

"But do not the negroes have access to the Gospel through the stated ministry of the whites? We answer no; the negroes have no regular and efficient ministry; as a matter of course no churches; neither is there sufficient room in white churches for their accommodation. We know of but five churches in the slave-holding states built expressly for their use; these are all in the state of Georgia. We may now inquire if they enjoy the privileges of the Gospel in their own houses, and on our plantations? Again we return a negative answer. They have no Bibles to read by their own fire-sides—they have no family altars; and when in affliction, sickness, or death, they have no minister to address to them the consolations of the Gospel, nor to bury them with solemn and appropriate services."

The marriage tie is not permitted to slaves. Hence the unions which they form are liable to be constantly broken up. The slaves feel this most acutely. But what avails it? Their feelings and their affections are utterly disregarded. The agonies of a slave mother, bereaved of her children, are no more respected than the lowing of cattle after their young.

But the Committee beseech you, gentlemen, to remember that this state of things involves a direct violation of God's ordinance of marriage, and leads to a system of immorality too gross to be portrayed, and too hateful to be endured, in any community where slavery does not exist. In the case of religious slaves, separated from each other by sale or otherwise, the Baptist Church decided in 1835, that they were to be regarded as civilly dead, and might, therefore, form new connexions.

In the sale of slaves, it occasionally happens that some of this unhappy class are Christians. Favoured by some providential circumstances, they have learned to value the Gospsl and to embrace the Saviour. In these cases, to enhance their value in the market, the fact of their Christianity is dwelt upon with more than ordinary eloquence But what, gentlemen, is this, but putting up the image of the Redeemer for sale, and vending in the public market-places the graces of the Holy Spirit? Thus we perceive that in the practice of American slavery, the most daring profanity is linked with so great an amount of atrocious cruelty and moral turpitude as to fill every rightly constituted mind with feelings of horror and dismay.

It is against this execrable system that American and British Abolitionists lift up their voices, and demand, with unceasing energy, its immediate and total abolition. If, gentlemen, under a keen sense of the degradation and outrage inflicted on the helpless and unoffending—if, viewing their innocent fellow-creatures manacled, lacerated, and destroyed, under a system of relentless tyranny—if, beholding their fellow-men stripped of their manhood; and women, the glory of men, stripped of their liberty and virtue—if seeing the father unable to protect his son, the mother her daughter, from cruelty and infamy, they have sometimes denounced not only the system which admitted of these crimes, but its supporters and abettors—if in the excess of their zeal they have not always acted with discrimination and prudence, surely they might be forgiven this wrong.

The Committee do not make these remarks by way of apology for any who may have been betrayed into the use of language unworthy the dignity of the great subject they have advocated, or which may be supposed to violate the courtesies and charities of life; but they do feel it to be necessary to request you to turn your thoughts away from the advocates of the slave, whose measures you may condemn, to the consideration of the wrongs of the slave himself, and in his person to vindicate the claims of humanity, justice, and religion.

On the character of the recent exciting meetings which have been held in Scotland, the Committee pronounce no judgment, inasmuch as they are neither responsible for their origin, the mode in which they have been conducted, nor for their results. They feel it, however, to be a duty to entreat you to deal with the question to which public attention has been directed, on its own merits, with that calm and unbiassed judgment which is necessary for its proper decision.

By some the heavy charges brought against the American slave system are said to be grossly exaggerated, and one fact is usually adduced to prove it—namely, the increase in the slave population. The Committee admit that increase; but, gentlemen, a slight glance at the statistics of the subject will convince you that that increase is dreadfully disproportionate to that of the free people of their own colour, notwithstanding all the means resorted to in the slave-breeding states to produce a different result.

The slave population of the United States in 1820, amounted to 1,538,064; in 1830, to 2,009,031; and in 1840, to 2,487,355. The increase in the first decennial period was 470,967, or nearly 31 per cent.; during the second decennial period it was only 477,398, or but little more than 23 per cent.; representing a loss of life between the two periods, on the slave population, of about 150,000! a palpable proof of the murderous severity of the American slave system. But when we come to compare the relative longevity between slaves and the free men of colour, the case assumes a more fearful aspect still. According to Porter, who has examined the tables of population with scientific care, it appears that the number of free people of colour between the ages of 10 and 55, in every 10,000 of that class, is 6,243, whereas among the slaves it is but 5,195; showing a loss of life between these ages of 1,018. Between 55 and 100 the disparity is still greater; free people of colour, 736; slaves, 406. From these facts the general severity of the slave system may be gathered. Now it must not be supposed that the slaves are less prolific than the free people of colour. The reverse of this is the fact. The case stands thus: Free people of colour under 10 years of age, 2,884; slaves, 3,394. It is necessary to refer to the practices resorted to in the slave-breeding states, to account for this fact, for their production outweighs every other consideration. Another word is not, the Committee presume, required to prove the murderous cruelty and disgusting immorality of this atrocious system.

But it may be asked, what have these statements to do with the American churches: are they not the guardians of truth, the exemplars of purity, the enemies of slavery, the friends of the oppressed? You do not mean to bring an accusation against them? Yes, gentlemen, speaking generally, the Committee are compelled to say that they are the bulwarks of American slavery. Take any branch of the churches in the slave states you please, with two or three honourable exceptions, and you will find them not only the apologists, but the abettors of slavery, and the most determined opponents of abolition.

The Committee have before them the proceedings of many of these churches, or branches thereof, to some of which they will briefly refer. The Charleston and Carolina Baptist Association, in a memorial to the Legislature, says, "The undersigned would represent that the said association does not consider that the Holy Scriptures have made the fact of slavery a question of morals at all." And adds: "The right of masters to dispose of the time of their slaves has been distinctly recognized by the Creator of all things." The Union Presbytery of the same city avow their opinions as follows:—"Resolved, that in the opinion of this Presbytery the holding of slaves, so far from being a sin in the sight of God, is nowhere condemned in his Holy Word; that it is in accordance with the example, or consistent with the precepts of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles," &c. The Synod of Virginia has declared its opinion in the following terms;—"Resolved unanimously, that we consider the dogma fiercely promulgated by the said anti-slavery associations—that slavery as it actually exists in our slave-holding states, is necessarily sinful, and ought to be immediately abolished, and the conclusions that naturally follow from that dogma, as directly and palpably contrary to the plainest principles of common sense and common humanity, and to the clearest authority of the Word of God." It cannot be wondered at that the men who could be parties to such declarations as these should pronounce the Abolitionists to be actuated by "a misguided and

fiendish fanaticism;" or that a clergyman of Virginia should close a letter, "To Sessions of Presbyterian Congregations, within the bounds of the West Hanover Presbytery," in the following words:—"If there be any stray goat of a minister among us, tainted with the blood-hound principles of abolitionism, let him be ferreted out, silenced, excommunicated, and left to the public to be disposed of in other respects.—Your affectionate brother in the Lord, Robert N. Anderson." From an address circulated in South Carolina, written by a clergyman of the M. E. Church, the Committee make the following extract:—"From what has been premised the following conclusions result:—1. That slavery is a judicial visitation. 2. That it is not a moral evil. 3. That it is supported by the Bible. 4. It has existed in all ages. It is not a moral evil. The fact that slavery is of Divine appointment would be proof enough with the Christian that it cannot be a moral evil. So far from being a moral evil, it is a merciful visitation—'It is the Lord's doing and marvellous in our eyes.' And had it not been for the best, God alone, who is able, long since would have overruled it. It is by Divine appointment." A clergyman of North Carolina, in his sermons on the rights and duties of slave holders, maintained the following propositions:—"That no man nor set of men in our day, unless they can produce a new revelation from Heaven, are entitled to pronounce slavery wrong; and that slavery, as it exists at the present day, is agreeable to the order of Divine Providence." The Divine rights of slave holders he set forth in all their fulness; their duties he held to be the moral obligation to punish slaves when they deserved it; not, however, to chastise them when in a passion, nor to overwork them; and to be careful to have the slave children baptized, and orally taught to say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments."

These sermons received the approbation of the bishop of the diocese, were published, and extensively distributed in vindication of the claims of the Episcopal Church to be considered the champion of slavery. Nor was this all. In South Carolina "The Society for the Advancement of Christianity," consisting of clergymen and laymen, with the bishop at their head, reprinted them as a religious tract for gratuitous distribution. In 1844, the writer, Dr. Freeman, was elevated to the Bench as Bishop of Arkansas and Texas, a fitting reward for so important a service. To multiply quotations is unnecessary. The Committee feel persuaded that you, gentlemen, must have been revolted by the references already made. How different in their spirit and truthfulness are they to the noble decision of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States in 1793, when it adopted the "judgment" of the New York and Pennsylvania synods in favour of "universal liberty;" and appended in 1794 the following as a note to the eighth commandment as expressing the doctrine of the Church on slave holding:—

"1. Tim. i. 10, The law is made for man-stealers. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment; Exodus xxi. 15; and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it. *Hominum fures, qui servos vel liberos abducant, retinent, vendunt, vel emunt.*—Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and keep, sell, or buy them. To steal a freeman, says Grotius, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances, we only steal human property, but when we steal, or retain men in slavery, we seize those who, in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant lords of the earth."

But alas! for its consistency. In 1816, the General Assembly, while it called slavery a "mournful evil," directed the erasure of the note from the eighth commandment. Two years afterwards it adopted an "expression of views," in which slavery is called "a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature," but it only called on the violators of those rights to exert themselves to get rid of slavery "with no greater delay than a regard to the public welfare demands." But since that time nothing has been done to promote the abolition of slavery.

To how great an extent the church has become tainted with this crime may be gathered from a declaration of the Rev. J. Smylie, of the Amite Presbytery, Mississippi, in a pamphlet published four or five years since. He says:—"If slavery be a sin, and advertising and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the Divine law, and if the buying, selling, or holding a slave, for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal, then verily, three-fourth of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in 11 States of the Union, are of the devil. They 'hold,' if they do not buy and sell slaves, and, with few exceptions, they hesitate not to 'apprehend and restore' runaway slaves, when in their power." Such being the case the church has become powerless for testimony against the sin of slavery.

Daily News June 20. 1846

THE ANTI-SLAVERY PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Though the American Anti-Slavery Society, at its first organization and at every subsequent annual meeting, had declared, in the most solemn manner, that all its efforts were and would be directed towards awakening the consciences of the slaveholders, and that nothing could be more abhorrent to its principles than the encouragement of any forcible attempt to regain their rights on the part of the slaves; yet every possible effort was made by the press of the free states to excite prejudice against it in the minds of the ignorant and reflecting. Every conceivable charge was brought against it, and the English language could hardly supply epithets villanous enough to express the alleged atrocity of its designs. Among other choice phrases, perhaps the most ingenious was the term "*murder mills*," by which its printing-offices were designated. And this kind of denunciation, it must be remembered, was employed against the Abolitionists, by men who were in the daily habit of accusing them of making use of too harsh language in arraigning the guilty slaveholder before the tribunal of the world.

But the readiest method, after all, to stimulate the vengeance of the mob against any party is to charge its members with being infidels in disguise. Under the present development of Christianity, they who attempt sincerely to put in practice the precepts of the Great Teacher are most accessible to such a charge as this, and surely nothing can be more disinterested than the ready zeal with which the vile and abandoned rally in defence of that religion in which the concurrent testimony of their whole lives proves them to have no possible concern. It became unsafe for the Abolitionists to assemble publicly. In Boston, Massachusetts, a regular meeting of the Female Anti-Slavery Society was broken up by a mob composed, as was asserted at the time, of "gentlemen of property and standing." The office of the Anti-Slavery Society was attacked, and the mayor himself assisted in tearing down a sign in which the obnoxious word "anti-slavery," rendered it a disturber of the peace, and a fitting subject for the riot act. On this occasion Mr. Garrison was led through the streets with a halter about

his neck, and the lamp post only escaped the degradation of being converted into a gallows by a fortunate accident. In New York, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati, ferocious attacks were made upon the coloured population, in which houses, property, and, in some cases, even lives were destroyed. In Cincinnati the press of the *Philanthropist* was broken to pieces; in Philadelphia a large hall, erected for the accommodation of anti-slavery meetings, was burned by the mob; and, to crown all, in Alton, Illinois, the Rev. Mr. Lovejoy, editor of an anti-slavery newspaper, was murdered in endeavouring to extinguish a fire which had been kindled by the mob on the roof of a building whither he had fled for shelter. All of these outrages were committed in the Free States, were in most cases instigated, and in all apologized for, by nearly the whole newspaper press of the Union. The Abolitionists were told that it was their own fault if their property and lives were unsafe, and the law gave no redress to men who had outlawed themselves by their devotion to humanity. It was optional with them, it was said, whether they preached their treasonable doctrines or not. It may, perhaps, be a matter of choice with politicians and editors, whether they speak out the truth that is given them, but with no such wavering and uncertain grasp does the appointed hour seize upon the conscience of the true reformer. It wrings the God's message out of him, or leaves him to crawl through life a self-convicted traitor for ever after.

Such irregular outbreaks of sympathy, however, were not enough for the South. The legislatures of the free states were called upon to make abolitionism an indictable offence. The Hon. Edward Everett, then Governor of Massachusets, in his annual speech at the opening of the legislature of that state, earnestly recommended all "patriotic" citizens to abstain from the discussion of so inflammatory a topic. Other governors of the free states did the same. Yet so jealously sensitive and requiring was the South, that when M'Everett's nomination as Minister to England was laid before the United States for their decision, though no one denied his many eminent qualifications for the post, though even the Abolitionists admitted that he had earned it by his deference to what were called the "rights" of the Southern States; yet strenuous opposition was made to his confirmation, on the ground of his abolitionism! The only ground for this accusation against him, we believe, was his having expressed a hope that the "experiment" of emancipation in the British West Indies might result favourably.

The American Anti-slavery Society, in pursuance of its original design, had been in the habit of sending tracts, containing its arguments and a statement of its objects, to prominent individuals in the slaveholding states. Now even in those states the actual slaveholders constitute a very small minority of the white population. There was no danger that these documents would create any excitement among the slaves, to whom all education is strictly forbidden by law. But there was great danger that, if the non-slaveholding whites should become aware of the degradation which the institution of slavery entailed upon themselves, that the despotism which oppressed them would be overthrown. The transmission of such "incendiary matter" must therefore be prevented. The post-office at Charleston, South Carolina, was broken open, and a quantity of anti-slavery tracts were taken from the mails and burnt. A "committee of vigilance" was also appointed in the same city, to be present at the sorting of the mails, and destroy all similar matter that might be found in them. The postmaster-general, a northern man, not only justified these lawless proceedings, but even went so far as to recommend to his subordinates that they should exercise their discretion as to what should or should not be considered proper articles to be forwarded by mail. Nor was this all. A law was actually proposed in Congress, and defeated by a bare majority, declaring it illegal to transmit anti-slavery publications by the government mails! The abolitionists were not more fortunate in their attempts to forward their publications by other means of conveyance. Boxes understood to contain their tracts were broken open without scruple, and their contents destroyed. The vengeance of the mob took even a more ruthless turn. Schools, which benevolent persons had established in the free States, for the education of coloured children were attacked. The scholars were dispersed, and both they and their teachers, whether male or female, were subjected to insult, outrage, or personal violence. Nor did such brutalities want the sanction (whether open or implied) of the local authorities. When it was proposed to raise funds for the endowment of a college for coloured youths in one of the cities of the state of Connecticut, the government of the city remonstrated against it in the strongest manner, and the state legislature, we believe, finally interfered to prevent by legal enactment what was considered a public insult and misfortune Is anything farther needed to prove that the efforts of the Abolitionists were as necessary in the free as in the slave states? Yet we have only cited a few of the more prominent of what may be considered public outrages. It would be far beyond our limits to mention the thousand cases of individual wrong. Yet one may be useful as a specimen. In the free States of New Hampshire, a minister of the gospel, who undertook to journey from town to town for the purpose of delivering addresses on Anti-slavery topics, was arrested on a justice's warrant, dragged from the pulpit in the very act of lifting his hands in prayer, and thrown into jail as a common vagrant. The newspapers of the Free States (with rare exceptions,) chronicled these infamous deeds without a word of comment except perhaps in the shape of a rebuke to the Abolitionists for their folly and misguided zeal.

of an unjust and iniquitous system? In the prosecution of all such objects, they may rely on our cordial and energetic co-operation.

Since writing the above, we have received a generous contribution of two estimable ladies in Edinburgh, towards a fund for purchasing the release of the soldier MATHEWSON from the 7th Hussars. We shall be happy to forward this sum, and to receive further contributions.

Seventy-eight peers of France excused themselves under a plea of ill-health, from being present at the sitting of the 7th, for the constituting of the chamber into a court of justice for Henri's trial.

The *Ecclesiastical Gazette* for this month contains an advertisement from the fellows of St. John's college, Cambridge, requiring to purchase three or four advowsons of livings, with incomes of about 400*l.* a-year, and a population of about four or five hundred.

Professor Sewell intends to devote the period of his professional recess during the present autumn to practical inquiry into the most successful means which the virus of rabid animals may be counter-d, and the fearful results of hydrophobia ted.

an Grand Duke Alxander of Russia has sent for sive order to a mercantile house in Inverness

This.

holdin bitants of Aylesbury have determined on quantity it market in that town. A considerable town, an raw plait is made in and around the markets to present it has to be taken to other

The marin ld.

consent, is tace at Brighton, by her Majesty's towards defray sold, and the proceeds applied improvements in the expense of alterations and

We learn from kingham Palace.

city government of *Bunker Hill Aurora* that the Ireland between sixty ton have just sent back to Joshua Bates, that were seventy paupers, in the

The Marquis of Normanby is expected in Paris at the end of this month, to succeed Lord Cowley as ambassador at the Court of France.

The Rev. Mr. Simpson, vicar of Micham, after having previously resigned his living, has been received into the Roman Catholic Church.

A company is to be organized at Brooklyn, for supplying the people with good wholesome bread, at half the price charged by the bakeries of Brooklyn and New York.

A blacksmith, living in Franklin county, Pennsylvania, has just come into possession of an estate left him by a deceased uncle in London, valued at one million of dollars.

In Glasgow, good bread is now sold by many bakers at 6d. for the fine, and 5d. for the coarse 4lb. loaf.

About 100,000 Chinese bricks have recently been imported into Liverpool.

The fifth list of J. Reigum as opposed to Christ-

without punishment one time or another? And ought you not in such a case to give glory to Him, and be thankful that He would rather punish you in this life for your wickedness, than destroy your souls for it in the next life? But, suppose that even this was not the case (a case hardly to be imagined), and that you have by no means, known or unknown, deserved the correction you suffered, there is this great comfort in it, that if you bear it patiently, and leave your cause in the hands of God, He will reward you for it in Heaven, and the punishment you suffer unjustly here, shall turn to your exceeding great glory hereafter." (Expressions of horror.)

I take the following from a work entitled "Slavery

its sittings last week. We shall present an abstract of the business in our next number.

Despatches were received on Wednesday at the Colonial-Office from the Governor of the Mauritius and from the Governor of St. Helena.

Her Majesty the Queen Dowager of Great Britain will arrive at the Hague in a few days, and will reside in the palace in the Noordereinde. She will be accompanied by a Princess of Prussia, for whom apartments are prepared in the Hotel of Belle Vue. —*Dutch Paper*.

BRUTAL MURDER.—Considerable consternation prevailed in the neighbourhood of Blanket-row-Hall, on Wednesday, in consequence of a rumour that Thomas Green, a mariner, had murdered his wife. It seems that the wife was an habitual drunkard, and on that account she and her husband frequently quarrelled. On Tuesday evening his brother invited him to Drypool feast, to which he consented, but previously to leaving home he placed in the hands of his wife about 50s. He returned about 2 o'clock next morning, and in ascending the staircase stumbled over his wife, who was dead drunk, and unable to proceed any further. Perceiving the state she was in, he took the door-key from her pocket, and, having obtained admission to the room, he returned to the unfortunate woman. The first inquiry of the husband was with respect to the money, but his wife, was unable to answer him, from the combined effects of the drink she had partaken of and the injury she had sustained about two hours before the arrival of Green, by falling heavily down stairs. Her husband became enraged; he dashed her head several times against the stairs, and then, seizing her by the hair of the head, dragged her into the room, where he searched for his money, but did not succeed in finding it. He then left hold of her, and she fell on the floor. Whilst in that position the husband got into bed, but after being there about half an hour he darted out of bed, and again attacked his unfortunate victim, by jumping upon her body. He likewise struck and kicked her, and eventually knocked her head-foremost down stairs, where she lay moaning for a length of time, when the husband carried her up-stairs, laid her on the floor, and then retired to rest. On rising shortly before 6 o'clock, he was horror-struck on finding that his brutality had ended in the death of his wife. An inquest was subsequently held, and the jury returned a verdict of "Wlfiul murder against Thomas Green."

ULTIMATE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY.—If we turn our eyes to Christianity, we perceive, that with the exception of the barbarians of Africa—and even these it is on the point of disputing with Mohammedism—it holds in its hand all the savages of the rest of the world. In the first place, there is hardly an island of any considerable magnitude where it has not taken a station; others it constantly visits with its ships, and by degrees the population of every island of the ocean will fall under its influence. By holding the coasts of New Holland, it surrounds with a thread, which they cannot escape from, all the tribes of this fifth world —tribes the most barbarous which have yet been discovered. It will follow the same course there that it has followed in America. Christian civilization, landing on the shores of America, planted its foot upon the soil and connected itself with everything around it, in all directions; then drawing in this immense chain it penetrated to the interior, driving towards the centre the savage tribes, until at length, hunted from every quarter and forced into a narrow circle, they surrender the continent. In this way Christian civilisation will conquer New Holland; in this way it has already conquered three parts of America, which still presents a numerous population, and vast territories for its acquisition. This acquisition will be gained by it in two modes. The savages will either be converted and lost in its bosom, or they will surrender to it their soil and retire to the most distant regions. There will be no difficulty in furnishing this soil with population. Civilisation has the power of increasing its population in proportion to the extent of its ter-

12

Universe Aug. 28. 1846 13

New Anti-Slavery League.

From our own Reporter.

(Continued from our last number.)

Mr. Garrison was then introduced to the meeting. He was received with enthusiastic cheering, hundreds rising from their seats. He wished to know if they were in earnest when they gave him that reception? Were they disposed to regard him as the friend of universal liberty? Then he begged to tell them, that if they went over to America they would be deemed fit subjects for Lynch law. (Laughter and cheers.) What! were they in earnest? were there no apologists for slavery there? none to applaud those ancient slave-holding patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jocob? none to talk of sending Onesimus back to his master because he was a slave? Were there none to apologize for those pious men who plundered cradles of babes, tortured women by the slave-driver's lash, and sent men to the auction block? "Why then" said Mr. Garrison, "here's my hand for every one of you, and here's a heart that beats in unison with your own. (Great cheering.) If in all my toils and suffering which I have met in this cause I had not been firm, and unflinching, if I did not feel assured that though the masters have been and still are against me, that the slaves are with me, and that the free coloured population of America are pouring out their blessings on me, your presence would be the last place where I should wish to stand. I feel a little lifted up when I know that my exertions are making the slaveholder uneasy and uncomfortable;—a price is at this hour set on my poor head. The State of Georgia has offered a reward of 5,000 dollars for my head, and the legislature of the United States has sanctioned this decision. (Shouts of disapprobation.) But despite that decision I will exert myself until slavery be abolished, or until our boast is abolished that God has made all men equal and free. (Loud cheering.) When I came over in 1838, that distinguished opponent of slavery Thomas Fowell Buxton sent me an invitation to take breakfast with him. He also invited Dr. Lushington and many other friends of the slave, stating in his note of invitation, that a coloured gentleman, from Boston, would breakfast with him. I have indeed tried to be a coloured man in all my struggles in this cause, having identified my interests with those of the coloured people. (Cheers.) But we have no distinction of colour now with us. We have bleached out all the colour from our slaves. In our plantations are persons of white complexions and with the straightest hair. When the slaves run away they are advertized as so very white that they will pass for white people unless they are closely watched. We have bleached out all the colour of those who come from Africa, and, in the course of a few years, there will hardly be a coloured man in America. I need not tell you what those means of pollution are. Yet those who are steeped in that pollution, who raise and breed children for the market, generally are those who talk to the abolitionists against amalgamation, meaning a virtuous marriage between a white and a coloured person. Sir, slavery is a power so great and so mighty, that few individuals in our country dare to confront the monster; and even the boldest are even sometimes afraid. It is no common conflict in which we are engaged, because whatever forms of political oppression you may have here, or in Europe, or in the world besides, there is no power so dreadful and so exterminating, as American slavery; it began with the very beginning of the Union (hear), and it has grown with our growth, until it now holds complete mastery over the whole country, so that the two great political parties are eager to do its bidding; and religious sects bow before it and do it homage: in one word, it has completely subjected church and state. Above all, we are against church and state, because it is on the side of slavery; we say that it is the support of slavery, and they shall go down together. (Great applause.) It is said that the Abolitionists are assailing the American church; it is true. It is said they are assailing the American clergy in a body; it is true. It is said that they are assailing the Government under which they live; it is true. It is said that they are seeking the dissolution of the union; it is true. Why do I say this? Because the church is the stronghold of the system; because the clergy are active defenders of the system; because the Government is organically so constructed that it gives its entire support to slavery, so long as the slave holder shall desire it. Now, to come to facts, and to show you that I do not exaggerate in what I state, I will read for you a few extracts, giving you the very words of the abettors of slavery in the church. The Rev. T. S. Witherspoon, of Alabama, writes to the editor of the *Emancipator*:—

"When the tardy process of the law is too long in redressing our grievances, we of the south have adopted the summary remedy of Judge Lynch—and really I think it one of the most wholesome and salutary remedies for the malady of northern fanaticism that can be applied, and no doubt my worthy friend, the editor of the *Emancipator and Human Rights*, would feel the better of its enforcement, provided he had a southern administrator. I go to the Bible for my warrant in all moral matters. * * * Let your emissaries dare venture to cross the Potomac, and I cannot promise you that their fate will be less than Haman's. Then beware how you goad an insulted but magnanimous people to deeds of desperation."

The Rev. William S. Plummer, D.D., Virginia, writes (to the chairman of a committee of correspondence, appointed by the citizens of Richmond to oppose the progress of anti-slavery principles at the south):—

"I have carefully watched this matter from its earliest existence, and everything I have seen and heard of its character, both from its patrons and its enemies, has confirmed me, beyond repentance, in the belief that, let the character of abolitionists be what it may in the sight of the Judge of all the earth, this is the most meddlesome, imprudent, reckless, fiercest, and wicked excitement I ever saw. I am willing at any time that the world should know that such are my views. A few things are perfectly clear to my mind:—

"1. The more speedy, united, firm, and solemnly resolute but temperate, the expression of public opinion on this subject in the whole south, the better it will be for the north for slave holders, and generally for the slaves.

"2. If abolitionists will set the country in a blaze, it is but fair that they should have the first warming at the fire. * * *

"Lastly, abolitionists are, like infidels, wholly unaddicted to martyrdom for opinion's sake. Let them understand that they will be caught, if they come among us, and they will take good heed to keep out of our way. There is not one man among them who has any more idea of shedding his blood in this cause than he has of making war on the Grand Turk. Their universal spirit is to stand off and growl and bark at men and institutions, without daring to march for one moment into their midst, and attack them with apostolic fearlessness.

"With sentiments of great respect, I remain yours, &c., "W. S. Plummer."

(Shame, shame.) Englishmen, that is the liberty we enjoy in republican America. They give men

Lynch law, and burn men at the stake in the south. No man can go from the north to the south with a scrap of abolitionist paper with him, but he would be in danger of his liberty or of his life. The *New Orleans True American* says—

"We can assure the Bostonians, one and all, who have embarked in the nefarious scheme of abolishing slavery at the south, that lashes will hereafter be spared the backs of their emissaries. Let them send out their men to Louisiana; they will never return to tell their suffering, but they shall expiate the crime of interfering in our domestic institutions by being burned at the stake."

In the *Charleston Courier*, of August 11, 1835, it is written:—

"Let us declare, through the public journals of our country, that the question of slavery is not, and shall not, be open to discussion; that the system is too deep-rooted among us, and must remain for ever; that the very moment any private individual attempts to lecture us upon its evils and immorality, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out and cast upon the dunghill."

The following letter, which appears in the *Oberlin Evangelist*, will show how religion and go together, though there is something which shocks one's feelings, in finding religion mixed up with such wickedness:—

"Georgia, Sept. 4, 1845.

"Dear Sir,—I take up my pen to write to you once more, though it is not I that write, but the Lord that writeth through me. Permit me to inform you that since I wrote to you last, I have come out and embraced the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and am now living in the glorious light and liberty of the children of God. We have had quite an interesting church meeting here this week in relation to Deacon H——. It was thought by many that he would be disfellowshiped, but finally his case was set forth in such a vivid light by the influential members of the church, our pastor among the rest, he was honourably discharged. For fear you will think the case worse than it really is, I will just state the facts (although you are such an abolitionist, I suppose you will think it bad enough as it is). The deacon had an old slave, that had been in the habit of running away, but had always been caught, until finally about two weeks ago, he made another attempt. No sooner was the old thing missing, than cousin H—— borrowed neighbour P——'s hounds, and started in search of him. He had not proceeded far in the woods before he found the old man perched upon the limb of a large tree. He ordered him several times to come down, but the old man, who was as stubborn as an ass, still maintained his position. The deacon then becoming excited, fired his gun at him. The ball passed through his ankle, and mangled it in such a manner that it mortified, and he died. But as I have before stated, our good pastor (may the Lord bless his soul) held forth for the justification of the deacon in such a vivid and heaven approving style, that he was discharged upon the ground that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own property—a judgment which would have been passed by any righteous man. Your uncle J—— buried his youngest child last week. Your cousin W—— thought some time of studying at Oberlin, but it is such an abolition hole, I do not think his father will let him go. I have partly bargained for about 50 slaves belonging to Mr.——. If I can get them as cheap as I expect to, I shall make profit on them, for I understand that the Orleans market is quite good now. I expect to send them down as soon as my driver recovers; for in flogging one of my old slaves the other day, he received a very severe wound from him, he having struck him with his hoe, whereupon the driver instantly drew his pistol from his pocket and shot him dead upon the spot, a fate which he justly merited. From his extreme age (being nearly 80 years old) I consider his death a gain and not a loss to me.

"In your last you spoke of visiting us next year. If you come, I pray you to leave your abolitionism behind, and show yourself a man. It is now time to prayer meeting, and I must close. My wife joins me in love to you.

"Yours, "J. F. F."

(Strong expressions of disapprobation.) Hail! Columbia, happy land. Such, you see, are some of the difficulties which beset us in our own country in advancing this cause. The slaveholders, and apologists for slavery, cannot bear the light. "'Tis conscience makes cowards of us all." (Cheers.) How different it is here. The moment a man speaks of liberty here, his voice is drowned in your cheers. I have been so accustomed to face a storm, that really your sunshine almost melts me down. I state to you nothing but facts. If what I say be not true—if any man can prove that what we say is not true—let him do it. (Cheers.) But if we speak nothing but the truth, then you must regard all Americans who say contrary things to what we say, as the worst of hypocrites, and liars of the first kind. But I have not come to England to defame the land of my nativity; it is as dear to my heart as it ought to be, or can possibly be. I have not come here to speak against republicanism (hear, hear, and cheers)—I have not come here to depreciate Christianity, as taught by Jesus Christ, but to vindicate it (cheers)—therefore I must tell the truth, for it is truth only that saves. I want to bring not destruction, but salvation to my country. (Hear, hear.) It is not only that we profess to be Christians, but we endeavour to turn Christianity to very good account in dollars and cents. (Laughter) We, with our Christianity, are worse than Mahomedans. The Mahomedans have a law that no man shall enslave his brother. When they take a man captive in war, they invite his belief in Mahomet, and if he profess belief in him, the man is admitted into the brotherhood of the faith. But in our country—our Christian land—when a man is born again it does not hasten his emancipation. It increases his value. A Christian slave is worth more dollars. He is proclaimed at the auction stand by the auctioneer as a Christian, and it is mentioned as a reason why he should fetch more money. I will read you the opinions of some slaveholders, to show that they attach importance to religion as a means of quietude and improvement of their slaves:—Thomas Cook writes from Marlborough district, May, 1845:—

"Plantations under religious instruction are more easily governed than those that are not."

John Dyson writes from Sumpter district, May, 1845:—

"Upon the discipline and subordination of plantations, religious instruction will be found generally and decidedly beneficial."

William Curtis writes from Richland district, May, 1845:—

"I have found the owners of plantations around not only willing but desirous that we should preach to their negroes; and they find, as they expect, a better spirit and subordination among them."

James Gillam writes from Abbeville district, May, 1845:—

"The deeper the piety of the slave the more valuable is he in every sense of the word."

Nicholas Ware writes from Brownsville, Marlborough district, May, 1845 :—

"All our negroes have, to a great extent, grown up under religious instruction. * * We scarcely hear of depredations upon stock, &c. They are more obedient and more to be depended on. We have few or no runaways, and corporeal punishment is but seldom resorted to."

N. R. Middleton writes from St. Andrew's parish, May, 1845 :—

"A regard to self interest should lead every planter to give his people religious instruction."

John Rivers writes from Colleton district, May, 1845 :—

"Religious instruction promotes the discipline and subordination on plantations."

It is in this form religion is taught to slaves, and thus is their manhood taken from them, and their freedom. Thus these wolves in sheep's clothing distort God's Gospel. You must not, therefore, call America a Christian nation or a Republican nation, but you must call it a bloodhound nation. I will read for you some advertisements common in the south, and other extracts, which will prove what I have said :—

"MINISTERS HOUNDS, AND RUNAWAY NEGROES.

"The Home Missionary of the Alabama Association, writing to the Alabama Baptist on the subject of ministerial support, attributes the unwillingness of the people to support their preachers, in part to the teaching of the anti-missionary ministers. And he represents one of these riding through the country with a train of about 20 hounds and with a brace of pistols, and a bowie knife projecting out of his pocket, showing a handle which would make a bludgeon, as his informant told him, 'large enough to kill the d——l,' and thus fully armed and equipped, he makes his excursions, hunting runaway negroes."

The Missionary of the Alabama Association goes on to say :—

"While it may be right and proper that some one should keep such dogs, and follow such avocation, we think it does not fitly become the ambassadors of Christ. Let the churches then awake to the subject of ministerial support."

A late number of the *Sumter Co. Whig*, published at Livingston, Alabama, contains the following atrocious advertisement—proving what is notoriously true, that it is a regular business at the south to train dogs to catch negroes, and to let them out by the day or job, to hunt the poor runaways in the swamps and forests! The advertisement is copied precisely as it appears in the *Whig* :—

"NEGRO DOGS.

"The undersigned having bought the entire pack of negro dogs (of the Hays' and Allen stock), he now proposes to catch runaway negroes. His charge will be three dollars per day for hunting, and 15 dollars for catching a runaway. He resides 3½ miles north of Livingston, near the lower Jones' Bluff-road.

"Nov. 6, 1845. "WILLIAM GAMBREL."

O! friends, what a horrible state of society is this! (Strong disgust manifested by the audience.) And yet I never knew a minister of the Gospel, nor a church take a step in averting the evil. Breathes there a man created in God's image, and for whom Christ has died, who ought to be treated so? (Cries of "No, no.") And why not? Why, because men, all men, are equal. Mr. Garrison then read extracts, to show that the American Government had sanctioned the employment of dogs in catching runaway negroes. For the negro runs away from his white Christian master, if he can, even to the red Indians in the woods. I will read you the words of our judges and courts, which authorize the killing of slaves :—

"That a proclamation of outlawry against a slave is authorized whenever he runs away from his master, conceals himself in some obscure retreat, and, to sustain life, kills a hog, or some animal of the cattle kind."—See *Haywood's Manual*, 521; act of 1741, c. 24, s. 45.

"State of North Carolina, Lenoir County.

"Whereas complaint hath been this day made to us, two of the justices of the peace for the said county, by William D. Cobb, of Jones county, that two negro slaves belonging to him—one named Ben, commonly known by the name of Ben Fox and Rigdon, have absented themselves from their said master's services, and are lurking about in the counties of Lenoir and Jones committing acts of felony;—these are in the name of the state, to command the said slaves forthwith to surrender themselves, and turn home to their said master. And we do hereby also require the sheriff of the said county of Lenoir to make diligent search and pursuit after the above-mentioned slaves; and them having found, to apprehend and secure, so that they may be conveyed to their said master, or otherwise discharged, as the law districts. And the said sheriff is hereby empowered to raise and take with him such power of his county as he shall think fit for the apprehension of said slaves. And we do hereby, by virtue of an act of Assembly of this states, concerning servants and slaves, intimate and declare, if the said slaves do not surrender themselves, and return home to their masters immediately after the publication of these presents, that any person may kill or destroy said slaves by such means as he or they think fit, without accusation or impeachment of any crime or offence for so doing, or without incurring any penalty or forfeiture thereby.

"Given under our hands and seals, this 12th of November, 1836. "B. COLEMAN, J. P.
"J. JONES, J. P."

"TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

"Runaway from the subscriber, about three years ago, a certain negro man named Ben, commonly known by the name of Ben Fox; also one other negro, by the name of Rigdon, who ran away on the 8th of this month.

"I will give the reward of 100 dollars for each of the above negroes to be delivered to me, or confined in the gaol of Lenoir or Jones county, or for the *killing* of them so that I can see them.

"Nov. 12, 1836. "W. D. COBB."

The *Wilmington Advertiser* (North Carolina), of July 13, 1838, contains the following advertisement :—

"Ruaway, my negro man Richard. A reward of 25 dollars will be paid for his apprehension, *dead* or *alive*. Satisfactory proof will only be required of his being killed. He has with him, in all probability, his wife Eliza, who ran away from Colonel Thompson, now a resident of Alabama, about the time he commenced his journey to that state.

"D. H. RHODES."

Such is slavery in America! And yet the abolitionists are stigmatized as infidels, because they would have no such Christianity or republicanism as sanctioned such atrocities. Slavery is a curse wherever it is found. It not only smites with barrenness the most fertile soil in the world, but it makes human life cheap, and in fact, of no value at all. (Cheers.) A year ago I thought I would collect from the newspapers all the horrible details of killing, maiming, &c., connected with slavery, and put

them in my paper. My collection was imperfect, for I had no southern papers, for they will not send papers to me from the south. I took the northern papers, and took out of them the most bloody deeds. They are very few indeed, but they show the state of society there, and a state of insecurity for human life such as can nowhere else be found. The list was begun a year ago, and this paper is full of short paragraphs. (Here Mr. Garrison unrolled a paper, the width of one of our columns, made up of short accounts of murders, &c., and unrolled it from end to end. It was above 12 yards long. There were calls for a few to be read; Mr. Garrison then read two or three and then continued.) And yet there are those who attempt to excuse this state of things. I am sorry that there are Englishmen disposed to apologize for those American Christians who keep blood hounds! They say, they are under a great mistake —they are in error, but you must call such Christians no hard or bad names. But I say the American people are excluded from apology. They hold the declaration in their hand that all men are equal; then they enslave their brother, and whip him, and hunt him with bloodhounds, and profess the gospel of Christ. Now, no man can be excused for enslaving another, whether he be savage or civilized. (Great applause.) God has put a witness in every man's breast which protests against man holding a man in bondage. I never debate the question as to whether man may hold property in man. I never degraded myself by debating the question, "Is slavery a sin?" It is a self evident truth, which God has engraven on our very nature. Where I see the holder of a slave, I charge the sin upon him, and I denounce him. It was once said it would be dangerous to free the states at once. The slaves will rebel and cut their masters' throats. (Laughter.) These fears were all vain. But if not, let us do what is right. God has declared, if thou undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free. And yet after all our guilt, we do not repent. We Americans are cursing you British people in our hearts! We have a controversy with you, because you are not slave holders. Are we not Democrats? Do we not make all the thrones of Europe tremble? Does not Nicholas tremble at the glorious example which we have set? We are hard to be pleased in America. We sometimes taunt you Englishmen with having set us a bad example. So Americans say to excuse their own blood-guiltings. (Cheers.) For surely you could not force us to be slave holders! You could not force the tea on us! (Immense applause.) You said you would supply our market with tea, but we resisted you, and overcame you. But you have washed your hands of this traffic, and for this we hate you! Slaves are in America, in whom the love of freedom cannot be suppressed. They struggle and pant for freedom. They ford rivers, and morasses; they climb hills and mountains; they know they are in danger of being shot down and hunted down by dogs, but yet they brave the danger. The slave has escaped, he has no friend with him, but there is the north star which God has set in Heaven, and the fugitive panting for freedom, has heard that star will conduct him to an asylum called Canada, where the British flag waves, to give him shelter. (Rapturous applause.) 1,500 are already safely landed on the shores of freedom. I stand here as the representative of the American Anti-slavery Society. We begun our movement by laying a broad foundation. We united men of all ranks. We knew not whither the principle would lead us. We believed the principle was divine. Whatever then called for a sacrifice of the principle, we said, it must be taken out of the way. There were obstacles in the way. But God said, "Pluck out the right eye, cut off the right hand." We found the political party sanctioning slavery. We found religious bodies heeding no cries of the friends of the slave. Now, we had either to denounce these bodies, or to give up the cause. And some did give up the cause. They said, "the church is pro-slavery, and therefore guilty, but it is still the Church of Christ," and so they went and joined the enemy. These men have invented watch-words by which we should be known and hated wherever known. For they have gone all over the land. (Cries of "Shame, shame.") The Anti-slavery Society has been true to its principles,—true as the needle to the pole. Some wishing to injure our cause, would tell you that we affirm the Sabbath to be not divine, that we are anti-ministry and anti-church men. Those who say so, there is not one word of thuth in them. The anti-slavery cause has never discussed the questions of the ministery, the Sabbath, or the church. And how do you judge of their conduct if not by what they say? The friends of this movement have a right to their individual opinions on other points, but do not judge to condemn this cause because of the opinions of individual members of it. We have made ministers and members of a pro-slavery church uneasy, because we have denounced slavery, wherever it has been found. Our crime has been that we have unmasked the wolves in sheep's clothing. And because we won't gratify this minister or that member, they have gone away, and have undertaken to show that we have peculiar views of the Sabbath, the ministry, and other things. I protest against this mode of attack. (Loud applause.) You have just completed your noble struggle by the abolition of the corn laws. That struggle was maintained by men of all creeds, or it could not have been triumphant. Now, suppose a Baptist had said, I won't go with you in your struggle because you won't be baptized (laughter); and an Episcopalian said, I won't go with you in the corn-law agitation because you won't submit to the bishop. (More laughter.) Why, we do not come together in such struggles to agree about baptism, or Episcopacy, or Independency —we come to agree about one thing, and our one thing is the total and immediate extinction of slavery. (Cheers.) Suppose the alarm bell should ring, and call the city to extinguish a great fire. If a man, before he would assist in putting out the fire, should begin a theological discussion, to know whether you were agreed in doctrine or not, why, you would say that man is the incendiary. (Loud applause.) I declare that men who oppose us on such grounds are no abolitionists. Strong language is needed, for the present position of our society is a vital one. The constitution of the United States is in a compact of slave holding. One party are friends of slavery, and do all in their power to uphold it. Another party—the Liberty party they are called—they go to the ballot-box professing to befriend the cause of freedom, but they put men into power who uphold the accursed system we denounce. Now, we say this is not abolitionism. No friend of freedom can do so. In this sense we are revolutionists. We put on our banner, "No union with slave holders." (Immense cheering.) Now, what have we American abolitionists a right to ask of you Englishmen? You ought not to receive slave holders as honest Christian men. You ought not to invite them to your pulpits, to your communion tables. Will you see to it that they never ascend your pulpits? If you will, then the slave will bless you, and thanks from the American abolitionists

will come over in thunder tones for your decision, and you will give a blow to slavery from which it will not recover. We ask another thing of you. Send us no more delegates to the States, or, if you do, let there be no divinity about them. Nothing but common humanity can stand in the United States. (Cheers.) Send us no more Baptist clerical delegates, or Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Quaker clerical delegates. They have all played to the hands of slavery against the abolitionists. (Cheers.) From Dr. C—— down to the last delegation they have all done an evil work, and have strengtened slavery against us. Like the priest and the Levite, they have passed us by, and gone on the other side. They found the cause of abolitionism unpopular. The mass of society were pro-slavery, so they went with them, and we have gone to the wall. Send us no more if you please. (Cheers.) We have had to say, save us from our English friends, and we will take care of our enemies. There have been those who have gone over to America, and who have nobly stood their ground. They have passed through the fire, and no smell of it has been found on them. That man (pointing to the chairman, Mr. Thompson) has gone through it. (Immense cheering, continued for some time.) Though rising on the topmost wave of popularity at home, he consented to aid us, where he was sure to be mobbed and scouted. But he never blenched. He was not afraid to make himself the friend and companion of the negro; and if he had remained his life would have been taken. If we had desired it he would have remained and hazarded his life; but we said go. Now I don't know if he had been divine he could have stood it. While a man remains common humanity, I can trust him: but when he gets up into the air, where there comes something superhuman about him, I am afraid of him. (Cheers.) Another thing don't do. Send no more men to the south to get money. The Free Church of Scotland is like democratic America stained with blood. It has the price of blood in its treasury. Oh! that Free Church of Scotland! I am for freedom everywhere, and rejoice that church is a free one, but it has received a paltry bribe, and abetted slavery. I have no idea they will send back the money. The laity I believe would send it back, but the divinity prevents it. Would the church but send back the money she would rise to dignity and glory which she has not yet attained. If the money were to go back it would be a death blow to slavery; or if it did not immediately destroy it, it would be a millstone around its neck, which would sink down to the depths of the sea. Then, indeed, the slave holder would howl in anguish, but we would hold a glorious jubilee over a redeemed race. (Great cheering.) Another thing, don't you know that old England is on the auction-block in our country? (A sensation.) You don't know you are under the hammer of the auctioneer! You don't know the presumption of slavery. Should one of your coloured subjects go in a ship to the south slavery would demand that though British subject the coloured man would be imprisoned, and there he would have to lie until the vessel was ready to sail, and the captain has got his clearance papers. That is what slavery does to British subjects in the south. Does your flag wave in mockery over your heads, or not? There is a controversy between you and the Southern States of America. They would sell one of your subjects at the auction block, if the captain were not to pay the expenses of his detention in prison until he was ready to sail. (Disapprobation.) I want the people of this country to call upon the United States to repeal these wicked laws, or to say that there can be no treaty of amity between you and them. What would the Americans say, if you were to do the same to their subjects? Such is our law, and if there be but the law that is enough, and you ought to demand its immediate repeal. We have a law that all men are equal, and then we have a law authorizing one man to sell another. (Cheers.) Join us then in our efforts, for we are with you. Working men, slavery is your enemy. It works evil for you in the community. It is not democracy which enslaves. I do not denounce democracy. Democracy declares that all men are equal. Slavery does not necessarily exist with it, but in defiance of our republicanism. Never let the minions of tyranny confound republicanism and slavery. It also exists despite of Christianity. I want no Christianity mingled with the institutions of slavery. I want Christianity such as Jesus taught, such as Jesus practically exemplified, a Christianity which knows no colour or clime,—which comprehends us all—which makes the world our country, and all mankind our countrymen. Mr. Garrison seconded the resolution moved by Mr. Wright, and sat down amidst great applause.

A gentleman in the meeting, here asked a question respecting Mr. Garrison's statement as to British subjects being sold in the Southern States. The Chairman answered, confirming the remarks of Mr. Garrison, that such really was the law of the United States.

Mr. F. Douglass then addressed the meeting at some length. He said—The question has arisen this evening respecting the individuals attending the alliance. I wish to say a word about those gentlemen. I have nothing to say with regard to their being slave holders. I believe that none who are in London at the present time are slave holders. Slave holders are not compromising; they are uncompromising in their devotion to slavery; and any insult offered to slavery—the slightest opposition to slavery—is met with stern epposition on their part. They are not men to go into an alliance when they are not invited. It takes cringing, time-serving men to do that; A word with regard to the character of these men. It has been asked if they go the whole length of slavery as we have heard it to-night. No, they do not. But they are, in my opinion, the most deadly opponents of the anti-slavery cause. They do everything in their power to hinder the progress of that cause by misrepresenting the sentiments of the advocates and defenders of the cause of emancipation. I understand that there are some of the British members of the Evangelical Alliance present here this evening. I want to tell you, don't you dare to open your lips against the Roman Catholics depriving the laity of the privilege of reading the sacred Scriptures, without, at the same time, you address those slave holding, woman-whipping Christians in the United States (tremendous applause), who deny to three millions of people the rigt to learn to read the name of the God that made them. Take the occasion, whenever that question comes up (hear, hear), to pour into the unwilling ears of the American delegates the whole truth on this subject. (Loud cheers.) Tell them, that while they keep the Bible from the slave, they are unfit to rebuke the Popish Church. (Applause.) Mr. Douglass, after alluding to the deputation from the Free Church of Scotland, went on as follows:—

18 Universe. Aug. 28. 1846

One rev. gentleman, and I am sorry to say he belongs to rather a liberal class in the United States —I allude to the Unitarian body—(hear, hear)—the Rev. Dr. Dewey, while travelling in this country, stung to shame by the constant rebuke of such friends of freedom as Mr. James Haughton, sought an apology for the existence of slavery from the alleged fact, that there is an impassable barrier between the two classes, black and white, in the United States. That is the ground assumed almost universally in the United States. He next stated that the Negro had showed no moral or religious incapacity, and that all they required was, the privilege of education. He then gave a most humorous description of the style in which the Negroes are preached to in the slave-states, and concluded by moving a resolution to the effect, that as man was created in the image of God, he could not have been intended to become his fellow-man's property, used as a chattel.

The Rev. H. Solly, in seconding the resolution, observed, that although we could do little for the slave in his own country, though we could not go over there and help to break his chain, there were many Americans coming over here, and we could let them know what were our sentiments as to the atrocious system of injustice and sin, which is the deep disgrace and curse of their country.

A Mr. W. Collyer, from New York, then rose from near the platform, and, after some time, succeeded in obtaining a hearing. He said that he had been amused and astonished at the addresses he had heard, and the wilful misrepresentations which had been made of the state of slavery in America—(great uproar.) As an American, he said it was base to interfere with their social institutions—(renewed uproar.) He had the care of six thousand slaves—("Oh, oh)"—he was a medical man. The American slave holders did not view slavery as the English do. He could make every allowance for them. The benevolence of their hearts caused them to act as they did; they believed that they were acting conscientiously, justly, and honourahly. But the slave holders did not view it in the same light; they were accustomed to it. Mr. Collier then proceeded to enumerate several States in which slavery had been abolished; but happening, in alluding to Maryland, to speak of it as the state that coloured man Douglas came from, he raised a storm of groaning which entirely prevented him from going on with his remarks. He, however, requested the reporters to state, that he had merely used the common phraseology of his country, and had not intended any insult to Frederick Douglass.

The Chirman then called on Henry Vincent, who, in a most eloquent and impassioned address, advocated universal freedom, peace, and brotherhood.

Mr. J. H. Parry seconded the resolution, which passed unanimously. Thanks were voted to Mr. Thompson, for his conduct in the chair, and the meeting broke up about 12 o'clock.

SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

We continue and conclude our report of the Anti-Slavery meeting recently held in this city; and we again call the attention of the eminent Americans now with us to the startling statements contained in Mr. Garrison's speech, as reported in another column. They will act wisely, we think, in offering some remarks on these statements, and we again offer ready access to our pages for that purpose.

We have vanity enough to refer to, though not enough to permit us to quote, the highly flattering commendations which have reached us from several influential quarters, on the firm yet moderate tone of our editorial remarks. This is the course we have set before us, and from this course nothing will induce us to deviate. Firmness in our adherence to principle, blended with courtesy and candour, and true moderation, is the rule by which we desire and intend to regulate our literary labours; and glad we are to find that an enlightened public will sustain us in this course.

To guard against all mistake—to inform one or two who do not understand our true feelings on this great question, we deem it proper to say, that we entirely agree with Mr. Garrison and his colleagues in their views of the enormity, the sinfulness, the essential wickedness, of slavery — and ardent desires for its immediate abolition; but we do not sympathize with this denunciations of all who do not see as they see relative to the precise mode of conducting the movement. The man who does nothing in the cause, we condemn for inactivity; the man who does much, we honour for his energy; and the man who does all that he can, we respect none the less because he does not unite in our modes of action. This is our feeling on the general question; and for our views on the American branch of it, we refer the reader to our last number.

Since writing the above, we have met an esteemed and honoured friend, Mr. Pomroy, of the city of Bangor, in the state of Maine; and we are authorized by him to say, that on his return to his home, he will communicate his views to our readers on the question of slavery, and on other topics of general interest. We make this announcement with high satisfaction, as we never met an American on whose calm and enlighted judgment we would more confidently rely. He is a warm, and steady, and earnest friend of freedom and of man; and his communications will greatly interest all classes of our readers.

Bristol Mercury Aug. 29. 1846 19

SLAVERY.

To the Editor of The Bristol Mercury.

"Slavery! disguise thyself as thou wilt, thou art a bitter draught."

SIR—I beg leave to call the attention of your readers to a pamphlet lately published in this city, entitled "A Brief Notice of American Slavery and the Abolition Movement." It contains a forcible yet temperate exposure of a great and crying evil. It behoves us, I am sensible, to make allowance for the circumstances in which our transatlantic brethren have been placed, and for the tolerance of slavery which, by the force of habit and of early education, they have insensibly acquired. Still, after every reasonable allowance has been made on this score, slavery as it exists in the United States is, without question, a great moral abomination, an outrage on humanity the most grievous and palpable.

That a people vaunting the freedom of their civil and religious institutions, and many of them making high-sounding pretensions to zeal in God's service, and possessing great earnestness in promoting the interests of Christian philanthropy at home and abroad, should make no scruple of holding multitudes of their fellow-creatures in cruel and oppressive thraldom—of exercising on them, in too many instances, the most heartless barbarities—of carrying on an inhuman traffic, by which husbands are severed from wives and children from their parents—and, further, using the most unhallowed means to keep up the breed and promote multiplication of this unhappy race: constitutes a sum of enormities which bids fair to render the American name, so far as the citizens of the United States are concerned, a byword and a reproach to every enlightened and civilised community.

Now, in the hope of redeeming our American brethren from the reproach which they have so justly incurred, and in order to wipe off this foul stain from the annals of a people so nearly allied to us in respect of common origin and language, of manners and customs, of civil and religious institutions, I could wish to see the public mind of this country, and of the religious part of the community in particular, aroused to the serious and earnest consideration of a matter in which the interests of humanity and the honour of our common faith are so deeply involved. Much, it is hoped, may in time be done in aid of the abolition of slavery in the United States, by an earnest expostulation with our Christian brethren there, on the moral delinquency, and consequent guilt, which they have incurred, not only in upholding and countenancing an unchristian practice, but in actually participating in its blood-bought gains, and having, it is feared, in too many instances, concurred in inflicting most heartless barbarities on their helpless and unoffending negro brethren.

The narrative of Frederick Douglass, whose veracity has not been, so far as I can learn, satisfactorily impugned, contains some fearful and afflictive details on this painful subject.

Further, a tribute of aid and encouragement and sympathy I consider to be due to the abolitionists of North America, who, notwithstanding errors of judgment and differences of opinion amongst themselves as to their modes of procedure, are entitled to an expression of our cordial approbation for their noble and persevering efforts in a cause, their advocacy of which has subjected them to much reproach and obloquy, and even personal danger.

PHILELEUTHEROS.

ARISTOCRACY OF THE SKIN.—The *Liverpool Mercury* reports the following police case:—On Tuesday last two American sailors, named Alonzo Lewis and George Brookes, were placed before Mr. Rushton under the following circumstances:—It appears that a poor Hindoo, who sells tracts, went into the house where the sailors were for the purpose of selling his books. He succeeded in selling one, for which he got paid. One of the accused seized the remainder of his stock, and destroyed them. On the Hindoo remonstrating, he was immediately, with much abuse, ordered out, and, not instantly complying with the order, both the sailors assailed him. He was beaten and kicked, and fled for safety into the street. The poor fellow was followed by his assailants, who, as Mr. Moss, one of the witnesses, stated, beat and kicked him about the head and breast in the most dastardly manner. The seamen made no defence. As soon as this case had been heard, an elderly man, a negro, stepped forward to prefer another charge. The negro stated that as he passed the same sailors, one of them squirted his spittle into complainant's face, and, on being remonstrated with, the negro was immediately knocked down by one of the sailors, whilst the other threw at him a large stone. The negro had not given the slightest provocation. Their cowardly conduct did not stop here; for a poor woman, an Englishwoman, who was carrying a mulatto child in her arms, was struck in the face, and the child knocked down. In both these cases no defence was made. These republican sailors were excited by the dark skin of their victims to abuse and injure them. Mr. Rushton spoke with indignation of the brutal conduct of the prisoners, and told them that such conduct in England could not be endured; that the laws admitted no difference between white and black; and that the utmost punishment the justices could award for the offence was much too light. After consulting with Mr. Christopher Rawdon, who sat on the bench, Mr. Rushton ordered each of the sailors to pay the sum of £5 for each assault, and in default of payment to be imprisoned two months; he also ordered them to find bail to keep the peace, or, in default, to be imprisoned four months. We trust this prompt and salutary punishment may serve to convince such of our American visitors as venture to beat and kick a man because he has a black skin, that the law is too strong for them. We are glad to say that, in general, the American sailors are as well behaved and as respectable as our own. Now and then, however, the curse which slavery brings appears, and we have the results in acts of this kind.

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE report of the Anti-Slavery meeting, held in this city on Wednesday last, will be read with interest—with painful interest—by our readers. The parties who took part in it were Mr. Lloyd Garrison, the celebrated American abolitionist, and Frederick Douglass, a fugitive slave. The former has probably "laboured more abundantly" in the cause of abolition than any man on the other side of the Atlantic: the latter is one whom those who contend for the natural inferiority of the negro race will be little likely to bring forward in support of their theory. Frederick Douglass is no common man. Doubtless, he has lately been a good deal used to public speaking; but still, the force and freedom with which he expresses himself is, under all the circumstances of the case, most remarkable. His language is plain and to the purpose. His manner, though not deficient in energy, is, on the whole, quiet and subdued; and yet, there are occasional tones in his voice—not unlike the low growl of the lion—which hint at "something dangerous," and which would seem to indicate that he is a man not to be trampled on with impunity.

Messrs. Garrison and Douglass are on a visit to this country to endeavour to call forth expressions of public opinion against American slavery. They are likely enough to succeed in their mission; for wherever the facts of the case are stated, a mingled feeling of sorrow and indignation can scarcely fail of being excited. Slavery, indeed, as it exists in the United States, is perhaps the most monstrous anomaly that ever appeared in any age or country. With all the lights of Christianity and civilization, and in a country claiming to be free above all other countries, there are three millions of human beings held in bitterest bondage. The spectacle of "slaving blacks and democratic whites" is one which is constantly presented to the eyes of the traveller in the greater portion of the United States, filling him with grief and astonishment; yet so completely has slavery become a matter of course—so completely has "damned custom" blinded men's eyes to its guilt—that we do believe there are numbers of Americans who would descant eloquently, and in perfect good faith, on the blessings of liberty whilst complacently gazing at a slave auction! The fact is, they do not practically recognise the negro as a fellow-creature; and the appeal, "Am I not a man and a *brother?*" would meet with a most emphatic negative from the majority of Americans. There are many planters, probably, who treat their slaves—the domestic slaves, in particular—with something of kindness and consideration; but this is matter of feeling or caprice. The brief explanation, "it is only a nigger!" is almost everywhere a valid and sufficient reason for any sort of insult or outrage which the lordly white man may think

proper to inflict. To a southern American, the feeling so well described by a recent traveller (the author of "Hochelega, or England in the New World") would, indeed, be perfectly inexplicable:

"In entering Maryland (says that writer) the day's journey was rendered memorable to me; but it was by a very natural occurrence. At the last stopping-place, before arriving at the town, I saw a sight which filled me with a new and strange emotion—I saw a being which not one among thousands of our English people has ever seen. He walked, he spoke, he was tall and erect, with active, powerful limbs, and shape of fair proportions. He was made in God's own image—but he was a SLAVE! Poorly, scarcely decently clad, he had carried a load of peaches to the station, which little negro boys sold in small baskets to the passengers. He stood beside it directing the sale, between whiles staring at us with a stupid gaze. He had the receding forehead, coarse neck, and thick lips, the symptoms or effects of the merely animal instincts and intelligence. His complexion was very black—black as the cloud hanging over the land of his captivity—black as the sin of its accursed law."

In the free states of the union, too, the prejudice against the coloured race is deep and rooted to a degree that those who have not travelled in America would find it difficult to conceive. The coloured people are free by law, and many of them, who keep oyster-cellars and "stores," accumulate considerable property; but everywhere are they forbid to mingle with the dominant white race. At the Park theatre, at New York, for instance, no sum of money would procure the admission of a coloured person to the boxes or pit; and even in the gallery, which is only visited by the sweepings of the white population, a line of demarcation is drawn, and whilst on the right side of the gallery the spectator beholds a row of white faces, on the left is to be seen ranged the despised and down-trodden negro race!

Frederick Douglass must, indeed, have felt himself in a sort of dream when he got to England—when he found himself seated at white men's tables, and shaken by the hand by white men. At the Victoria-rooms, on Wednesday, when Douglass was speaking, our worthy mayor filled a glass of water, and handed it towards the speaker. His worship did this probably without giving the thing a thought, and as a matter of course, and few in the meeting would notice the occurrence. In the United States, a single act of that kind (except amongst professed abolitionists) would be provocative of the utmost astonishment. What! a white man—a mayor—a man in authority—hand a glass of water to a negro! Incredible!

It was with reference to this difference between the two countries that Mr. Garrison observed—

"He could not express the delight which it gave him to witness the way in which his beloved brother was everywhere received in England. He was welcomed as a human being, and not looked upon as a mere saleable chattel (hear, hear). There was no objection to him raised up by stupid prejudice. He (the speaker) might walk or ride, and eat and drink and dwell with him, although his skin was coloured, and find that he was respected equally with himself, or with any man. There was something so delightful in this—something so different from America, with her boasted freedom—that his heart was full to overflowing; and his spirit felt sad when he remembered that his brother must go back to the United States. He could not, however, be spared to the anti-slavery cause.

This hostile prejudice is all but universal, so that the English public may form *some* sort of idea of the obstacles which the abolitionists have had to encounter even in the "free states." As for the south, let them venture thither, and the reception they will meet with has been insolently proclaimed on the very floor of Congress. "Let an abolitionist," said Mr. Preston, in the Senate in 1838—"Let an abolitionist come within the borders of South Carolina, and if we catch him we will try him; and notwithstanding all the interference of all the governments on earth, including the Federal government, we will HANG him." And they would do it!

It may be asked, what can be done with people so violent and so prejudiced? Much. Slaveholders may defy "all the governments on earth," but for all that they are not inaccessible to public opinion. America, indeed, is more sensitive to public opinion than any other country; and for her to find herself regarded in Europe—and more especially in England—as "the land of slavery," would be intolerable. There certainly *is* danger that our interference may be considered as intrusive, uncalled for, and impertinent; but, in carrying great reforms, something must always be risked. It would be easy to taunt and to irritate America, but that would not aid the cause of the slave. Whilst, therefore, the English people express a just and strong horror of slavery, they would do well to abstain from anything approaching to bitterness or reproach. Slavery is the cancer of the United States, and were England jealous of the increase of that great country, she might, on selfish motives, desire the deepening and extension of the cancer. Such being the case, we might place our sympathy with the abolitionists on other grounds than that of hostility to the material interests of the United States, or of uncalled for interference in their affairs. The English people wish their American brethren well, and *therefore*—independent of a sense of duty, and of sympathy with the slave—they desire to see the extinction of slavery.

Americans, too, complacently imagine that their country is looked up to as the "land of liberty:" they ought to be made to comprehend that it is regarded, by thousands and tens of thousands of the friends of liberty, as the great upholder of slavery. Slavery is the great blot upon their character and institutions—the sad fact that stamps with falsehood all their professions—converts their solemnly-recorded assertion that "all men are born free and equal," into so much meaningless jargon—and that does more than all other causes in the world combined to cast ridicule upon, and to retard the progress of, free institutions.

These are things which Americans might be made to comprehend by the forwarding to them of addresses, in which plain-speaking shall be combined with a spirit of kindliness and good-feeling. The motives of the English people might be misunderstood for awhile; but in time it would be seen that their object was simply and honestly to promote the interests of the great human family, and to do what lay in her power "to make the world better yet." This is an object in which all good men of all countries may unite—unite, and never relax their efforts until America, North and South, shall not contain a slave.

American Slavery.

A public meeting was held on Tuesday last, at the Victoria-rooms, the Right Worshipful the Mayor, J. K. Haberfield, Esq., in the chair, for the purpose of hearing from W. L. Garrison, Esq., President of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and from Frederick Douglass, the fugitive slave from Maryland—the published narrative of whose life must have made his name familiar to every lover of freedom—a statement of the present system of slavery in the United States of America, and some suggestions as to the mode in which the inhabitants of Great Britain may most effectually promote the abolition cause. The attendance was numerous and highly respectable.

The MAYOR said that the present meeting, at which he had been requested to preside, was most pleasing to him as chief magistrate of this great and charitable and hospitable city; it was for the purpose of furnishing an opportunity to two distinguished men from America to impart information to his fellow-citizens upon American slavery, and to show, if they were able to do so, in what manner the people of this country might assist them to abolish slavery in the United States, without any breach of international courtesy and propriety, and consistently with that friendly moral influence which different countries had not only a right but were bound to exercise with

B. Mercury. Aug. 29/46

regard to each other. The name of William Lloyd Garrison was familiar to those who had paid any attention to the abolition movement which had been going forward in America during the last fifteen years (hear). To him belonged the honour of originating that moral enterprise; and, regardless of personal danger, though a reward was offered for his apprehension by one of the slaveholding states, he continued to devote his whole energies to the purpose of abolishing the institution of slavery in his native country. In what manner he sought to accomplish that object he (Mr. G.) would now explain to them. He was sure it would be gratifying to the meeting if it were found that the measures pursued for the termination of slavery were such that in their propriety they all could accord. If the information he (the Mayor) had received was correct, it would be satisfactory to them that the American abolitionists aimed at the achievement of their great purpose by moral means alone; that they abjured all violence—that they desired solely to awaken the consciences of their countrymen to the sin of slaveholding, in order to effect in a peaceful manner a change from slave to free labour. In addition to the company of Mr. Garrison, they had the pleasure of seeing among them that day an individual whose interesting narrative had been read by him (the Mayor), and which, also, had been extensively read in this city, and with whom numbers had felt a deep sympathy—Frederick Douglass. It would be gratifying to the meeting to know that a writer in the slave states, who (in an article entitled "Falsehood Refuted") had endeavoured to prove that no reliance was to be placed upon Frederick Douglass's statements, and that a slave so uneducated as he was could not have written such a composition as his "Narrative," had most unintentionally done Mr. Douglass the service of testifying that he was the individual he represented himself to be, by saying that he knew him in Maryland, as well as his masters, and all the gentlemen of whom he speaks. How far it was possible for an uneducated slave to write such a book as "The Narrative of Frederick Douglass," they perhaps might that day have an opportunity of judging for themselves. From Frederick Douglass they would hear details of the character of American slavery, such as could only be obtained from one who had experienced its hardships. To what extent the meeting would accord with the sentiments expressed by their American friends he did not pretend to predict: but he felt no hesitation in assuring their visitors that men who had come to their shores from the other side of the Atlantic, to plead for three millions of their countrymen in hopeless slavery, might depend upon having an attentive and respectful hearing from a meeting of the kind and generous citizens of Bristol. He then called on Mr. William Lloyd Garrison to afford his pleasing history.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Esq., said—As the humble advocate of three millions of enslaved human beings on the other side of the Atlantic, he felt greatly strengthened and delighted by such an interview as the present. To know that he was addressing those who had washed their hands of the crime of slaveholding—that he was speaking to those who had set America a glorious example in the great march of universal emancipation—to be with them, to see them, and to feel assured that all their sympathies were on the side of those who were struggling in the United States for the abolition of slavery there—all these facts gave him strength and filled his heart with comfort and delight. He was moreover greatly gratified to see their honourable mayor in the chair. The anti-slavery movement was of God, and it was not possible for any man, however high his position, to bring any honour to it (hear), and yet there was no man, however exalted he might be, who could fail to get honour by showing that he was the friend of emancipation. The object which had that day brought them together was one which happily overleaped all sectarian creeds, all party peculiarities—might he not say also all national boundaries and distinctions? (hear.) The cause was that of universal man, and therefore they and he and all in the world had a common interest in it. Hence he rejoiced to see them assembled without distinction of party or sect. He knew nothing of geographical boundaries in regard to the great question of Christian duty. Wherever he saw oppression on the face of the earth there would he be in spirit to confront it and to call for its overthrow, and there the spirit of every man who respected liberty would be found (cheers). It was vain for a Christian to say "I do not belong to the country oppressed—you who suffer the oppression are American or English, and, therefore, I need not interfere even in expression." He knew that it was considered a delicate matter to call on people in one part of the world to interfere with the practices of people in another part; he knew, too, in regard to the country from which he came that they were a people peculiarly sensitive in that respect. He knew what would be said of the present meeting, and that it would be deemed by many in his country to be highly impertinent and offensive: but he knew also that it would be only those who would trample on their common humanity who would say this, such only as were determined still to continue the traffic in the souls and bodies of men (hear). But those who loved liberty—and there were some who worshipped at the shrine of liberty, and some who remembered as in bonds those bound with them,—they would give them their blessing in the name of the slaves who could not plead for themselves, and would be delighted to know that the Bristol people sympathised with them. He had, therefore, as an American and a friend of the American slaves, no apprehensions on that score—he did not think it unwise for them to come and hear something about the state of those slaves, nor did he fear that any interference at their hands would do the anti-slavery movement harm (hear). On the contrary, he believed that it would do much good. What! no right in one country for the people to denounce crime and outrage in another—no right in the people of one land to endeavour to save the people of another from their sins? Why then did they send forth their missionaries for the purpose of interfering with the religious and political institutions of the heathen (hear). Not that they had any warfare with governments or institutions when friendly to human rights; not because they wished to do harm anywhere; but because they took the whole world into their religious sympathy, and were concerned for the regeneration of the whole world (applause). While America was sending out her missionaries to the heathen in all parts of the world, to overthrow their institutions because they were not Christian, surely it was competent to the people in this country to send out their advocates to put down in America a system of heathenism not to be surpassed in darkness by any which existed in any other part of the world (hear). He did not ask them to take up arms to put down American slavery. He did not ask the government of this country to interfere with violence to liberate the oppressed anywhere. All he asked them was—were they the friends of universal freedom? Did they abhor slavery? Were they anxious to see those now in bonds redeemed and restored to their place in the universal family? Would they tell the oppressors on the other side of the Atlantic that thus they thought and felt, and give to those who were struggling there in the cause of freedom "God speed" and their blessing? (cheers.) This was the simple request he had to make, and with which he hoped they would comply: and although it might appear that he was asking for that which would not be of signal service in overthrowing slavery, let him tell them that there was not a single whisper of theirs against slavery abroad that was not heard by the slaveowners of the southern states (hear). Not a resolution encouraging the abolitionists and condemning slavery which was not known to and did not affect the system in his own country. In the dark hours through which the American abolitionists had passed, how cheering it had been to them, who had taken up the cause of the slave, to hear the voice of encouragement coming across the Atlantic bidding them not to despair—not to turn back on the way—but to go on till the jubilee was ushered in (cheers). With regard to interference, who should complain of it—the American people? They were those who not only gave their sympathies to the Poles, when they were struggling against the despotism that was crushing them, and to the Greeks, but who said to them, "You shall have something more substantial than sympathy—you shall have arms and amunition, and you shall have men—Americans who will go and aid you," and they went (hear). Here then was the most marked interference, and surely a people who could feel themselves justified in pursuing such a course towards another nation need not complain of the people of England for merely raising up their voices against the sin of American slavery. There was another reason why the people of England were bound to interfere—the Americans taunted them with having put slavery upon them—they said the English had forced the sin upon them, and that had it not been for England, America would never have held slaves. Let England meet them thus—let them not have that to say—let her extricate them from the evil and say, "having, as you say, entailed it upon you, we will take it off again" (cheers). Thank God they had Canada so near to the United States—thank God that the flag of old England floated near to the star-spangled banner, and gave some protection to the slave; and that, while the proud banner of America said to the oppressed negro, "There is no spot in the United States where you shall be free from your oppressor," the flag of old England said to all in the prison-house of bondage, "Escape from your bondage, come here and be free (cheers); come here where there is none to molest you or make you afraid." And he was happy to say thousands had fled to Canada—although they knew nothing of the geography of the intervening country, thousands had made their way across the interminable wilderness, swimming wide rivers though hunted by bloodhounds, and had found freedom in that country. He blessed God that no less than 15,000 runaway American slaves had found refuge in Canada. Was not that an excellent way of removing any evil which England might have entailed on America years ago? But it was a lie to say that England had entailed slavery on America (hear). It never was—it never could have been a matter of coercion. Strong as the mother country was she was never strong enough to force upon America anything she did not approve. England tried her hand in 1745, when she attempted to force taxed tea upon the Americans, but she failed—America would not submit to it, and she did not submit to it, and if she had had the same aversion to slavery it never could have been forced upon her, and she would have had no slaves. What was the system of slavery in the United States? It was not a system of civil oppression or ecclesiastical despotism—it was not a system under which men were simply over-worked and poorly paid—where the labourer was in a state of destitution: that was a state which might exist and did exist in England. The system of American slavery had no parallel in any country on the face of the world. Political oppression or eccle-

siastical tyranny did not destroy man; they left something of him; they gave him some chance as a human being—they did not deny his humanity, they interfered with his liberty and abridged his rights, but they did not dehumanize him and make him a mere brute (hear). American slavery was a man-killing institution, it annihilated men. The slaves left toiling in their chains, and undergoing every hardship of oppression, were not men but living corpses—their intellect blotted out, their manhood taken away, and their souls destroyed, as far as it was in the power of their oppressors to do that awful work. Of all men on the face of the earth, the slaveholder claimed the most power. The master of necessity exalted himself as a God. The slave he claimed to be his: it would not do to let him have any will of his own—to have any freedom of locomotion—any power to make contracts; no, his whole being must be absorbed in the will of the man who claimed him as a property. Take away this power, and there would be an end of slavery. The system of American slavery utterly annihilated marriage, so that the slave states, in a moral point of view, were degraded to the awful condition of Sodom and Gomorrah when they awakened the wrath of an offended God. It would not be right in that audience to enter upon the subject: he would simply state that an awful amount of sin prevailed, and that a complete destitution of all moral purity had resulted from the overthrow of the sacred institution of marriage. If there were no other sin to lay at the door of slavery, surely it would be enough to make every right-minded man and woman cry out against it to know that it destroyed the marriage institution, and compelled its victims to live in a state of unholy licentiousness and impurity—even against the wills of the poor slaves themselves (hear). It was enough to move the hearts of good men to think of the American government and the American church combining together to overthrow, by force, the marriage institution, and to spread uncleanness throughout the land (hear). But he would not dwell on the horrors of American slavery. There was one present into whose soul the iron had entered, who had been reckoned in the ledger of the American slaveholder as a mere personal chattel—a mere thing—a mere brute, to be bought and sold. He had been under the accursed lash of the slave-driver, and bore the marks upon his person; and he would tell them what American slavery was. No thanks to the genius of American liberty, however, that he was there that day (hear, hear)—no thanks to the star-spangled banner that he stood erect in an assembly of free men who gladly owned him as a brother, and were willing to testify that he gave the world assurance of a man (cheers). He (Mr. Garrison) could not express the delight which it gave him to witness the way in which his beloved brother was everywhere received in England. He was welcomed as a human being, and not looked upon as a mere saleable chattel (hear). There was no objection to him raised up by stupid prejudice. He (the speaker) might walk or ride, and eat and drink and dwell with him, although his skin was coloured, and find that he was respected equally with himself, or with any man. There was something so delightful in this—something so different from America, with her boasted freedom—that his heart was full to overflowing; and his spirit felt sad when he remembered that his brother must go back to the United States. He could not, however, be spared to the anti-slavery cause; the great work of emancipation had to be accomplished. He (Mr. Douglass) had done much; and, with the blessing of God, would persevere in the good work. He would go back a marked man, liable to be seized and hurried back to his enraged master, and to be subjected to all the punishments which he could inflict. There was no spot in the United States where he could stand with any safety. Yet he would not shrink from the trial (loud applause). If they must take his life he was willing to die—to die as a martyr, that in his death the slaves might gain their freedom (cheers). The growth of slavery in the United States had been remarkable. When America threw off the shackles of the mother country there were in the states about 500,000 slaves. The Americans then became a free people; they were independent of every nation on the globe, and they had the power, if they had possessed the will, to say to those in bondage, "Go, and be free; slavery shall not exist upon the American soil." They put forth their declaration of independence, that all men were born with equal rights, but they kept their slaves nevertheless; and they had since multiplied to such an extent that instead of 500,000 they had now three millions of slaves—instead of five slave states they had now fifteen, and the accursed system still cried, "give, give," and was never satisfied (hear). Hence had America stolen Texas in the most fiendish manner, and against national law annexed it to their own territory. They had not been content with making that seizure; it was the deliberate design and fixed purpose of the American government to conquer and subsidise Mexico, in order that out of the added territory they might carve more slave states. They might not do it all at once; they would first seize California, and then they would go on, as their slaveholding desires increased, till they had got the whole of Mexico. They had a design upon St. Domingo, and they intended to have Cuba. This might all seem a dream—a mere idle dream to the people of England—they might regard it as mere empty bluster, and as nothing else, but they might depend upon it that it was the matured design of America to possess herself of all the places he had mentioned. After enlarging on this point, the speaker went on to observe, what the governments of Europe would do about it he could not tell; this, however, he knew, that unless the friends of humanity and of freedom throughout the world combined to promote the overthrow of American slavery, Mexico was doomed, Cuba was doomed, and glorious St. Domingo was doomed. In the year 1783 the market value of the slaves in the United States was estimated at 200 millions of dollars; at the present time that value had increased to between 1200 and 1500 millions of dollars. It might be supposed that to attack so vast, so mighty a monopoly was no easy task. And yet the abolitionists wished to injure no man. The results of emancipation in the West-India Islands had proved that it was no vain or evil thing. The abolition of slavery there had, upon the whole, conferred benefit on the country. It had been remarked that the existence of slavery in a country showed that the religion of that country was not the religion of Jesus Christ. The American church was on the side of oppression, because the powers were on the side of oppression. Slavery, although local in its position, was universal in its power throughout the United States. Go into what district of the country or into what circle they would, they would find the spirit of slavery prevailing. There was no political party wishing to succeed in its measures which did not consult and sue the slave power, and no form of religion which wished to extend its influence throughout the country which did not fall down and worship the Southern Moloch. The spirit of slavery had taken possession of the church and the government, and those who would be true to the cause of humanity must be prepared to assail both church and state (hear, hear), and to declare that that government which would enslave one-sixth of the population was not fit to govern a free people, and that that church which received into her communion those who participated in, or encouraged the traffic in human flesh and blood, was not entitled to the respect due to a Christian church (cheers). It was, therefore, not difficult to understand why it was that the abolitionists were cried down as "no government," "no church," "no religion" people, and as being desirous to subvert all the institutions of the country (hear, hear). They wished to see a free government worthy of a free people, and a religion such as Jesus taught on earth (cheers), and therefore they were denounced as the enemies of government and religion. The speaker next read some extracts from a speech of an American slave-owner, Mr. Thomas F. Marsh, of Kentucky, containing a statistical comparison of the states of New York and Virginia, and showing an increase on the population of 61 per cent. in favour of the free state. He then went on to argue that the interest of the commercial classes in this country were deeply concerned in the question, for he could tell them that so long as slavery retained its power in the United States there could be no reliance on what course of policy might be pursued by the Congress. The slave power imposed the tariff of 1816, and John Calhoun, who supported that tariff, was now endeavouring to carry free trade in order to defeat New England and bring her to their own level. Let it not be believed that the democratic party had any real love for free trade—it would uphold free trade in cotton but in nothing else—its whole policy was designed to uphold slavery (hear). After remarking that the slave states were pauper states, not capable of maintaining themselves, and that they drew largely upon the industry of the free states, Mr. Garrison went on to remark that, although the cause of peace was unquestionably advancing, yet the settlement of the Oregon question had in reality little or nothing to do with the growth of the pacific feeling. The slave powers knew that Oregon was not a climate out of which slave states could be carved, and therefore they gave it up. The Texas question was about to be settled at the same time, and the slave holders said to the western states, "You vote for Texas and we will then go for the line 54.40." The western states went in favour of the annexation of Texas and for making war on Mexico, and that done the slave holders turned round and, not wanting Oregon, voted for 49. One good would grow out of it—the western states, seeing that they had been juggled, were now going against slavery, and the effect he hoped would be to hurry oppression to—not a premature, for that could not be—but to an early grave (cheers). A word or two as to the present state and prospects of the abolition cause. The banner of immediate emancipation was first flung to the breeze in 1831; the abolitionists were then a small body, but they had gone on steadily increasing in numbers and in power. They had to suffer a good deal of calumny, reviling, persecution, mobocratic violence, and, to some extent, legislative enactment, but still the cause was progressing. They had carried a great many of the outposts, and they were now attacking the citadel itself (cheers). They were grappling with the constitution—they were calling upon the northern states to dissolve partnership with the slave states, as no man could remain in union with them who was not prepared to turn his back upon humanity and to resist and violate the ordinances of God. They declared that to admit a slaveholding oligarchy to power upon the floor of Congress was to admit of such a compact as the world had never seen before, and such as reason and religion could never sanction; hence they (the abolitionists) stood upon the ground of a great moral revolutionary movement. They knew that if the men of the north dissolved partnership slavery must die; that without the power derived from the northern states the slave holders could not hold their slaves in chains a single

hour, and therefore they applied their energies to the promotion of such a change (cheers). They put it upon the ground of humanity, prudence, religion, and he was happy to state that the cause was rapidly progressing. To such an extent had it increased that in old Faneuil-hall, Boston, the cradle of liberty, as they of America delighted to call it, they had held their meetings, and the people of Boston were now joining in the cry of "No union with slavery" (cheers). O, it was a glorious exhibition of high moral character to see a people willing to disfranchise themselves for a time in order that they might have a free country. Mr. Garrison then went on to explain that, by the laws of the slave states, any coloured man, although a subject of England, going out as a mariner or traveller, was seized and thrown into prison while his ship remained there, and that if he did not pay the gaol charges he might be brought to the auction block and sold. He concluded by imploring the aid of England for the abolition cause, and exclaimed—

> Oh that land, that land for me,
> Where every living soul is free;
> Where, though winter comes, and the wild storms rave,
> No Tyrant lords it o'er the Slave!

Mr. Frederick Douglass said—He felt sincerely grateful for the opportunity afforded him of speaking to them of the wrongs of three millions of his coloured fellow-countrymen in the United States. He had nothing to commend him to their consideration in the way of learning. Slavery, they must have already perceived, was a poor school for rearing moral and religious teachers, and hence if he, having been the subject of slavery, should betray, in the course of the few remarks he had to make to them, a want of that refinement found only among those who had superior advantages, they would of course set it down to the right cause, and not add anything to the already heavy weights that crushed down the slaves of the United States to the level of the brute creation (hear, hear). They were doubtless aware that in the United States there were a certain class of philosophers who denied to the coloured race equal humanity with the whites, and who spoke of them as being the connecting-link between humanity and the brute creation. Of course he did not believe their philosophy (laughter and applause). The subject of American slavery was now beginning to attract considerable attention both in this and other countries. During the last twelve months a series of public meetings had been held in this kingdom, and there was at the present time much light on the subject: and wherever intelligence of the question had gone he was happy to say that a corresponding desire to do something to promote it had been found. He was not there to trouble them with any horrible details of his own experience in slavery—those would be found in the narrative of his life—but he was there to speak generally upon the question of slavery as it now existed in the United States. There were in that country three millions of slaves, and their condition physically, morally, and intellectually was such as to excite in every true man the deepest feelings of sympathy for the slave and indignation against the master. He knew of no country in which slavery had existed or did now exist, where it assumed a more horrible form than in the United States of America (hear). Not so much in the lashing, branding, cathauling, hunting, imprisoning—as in the moral condition of the slaves. In the first place he was denied all intellectual improvement. It was made by the laws punishable with death, for a second offence, to teach a slave his letters. In the next place, there was, as they had been told, an utter abolition of the institution of marriage. A slave was not protected in that relation. He might be separated from his partner at any time at the will or caprice of his master. His own wishes or will were never consulted—he lived only for his master's interest, and his master might do whatever he liked with him. He was the more anxious to bring fairly before them the horrors of slavery generally in the United States, because he found a disposition here among a certain class of writers and others to regard American slavery with some degree of indifference (hear, hear), on account of the political disadvantages under which some portion of the subjects of this country were said to labour. And he had heard individuals here say, "Why talk to us of American slavery—why speak to us of slavery 3000 miles off? We have slavery in England!" Now, he thought that this application of the term "slavery" had the effect of removing in some measure the horror with which the system had hitherto been contemplated (hear, hear). He wished, therefore, to show that slavery in the United States was a very different thing from anything with which, in this country its name had been connected. He believed that those who used the term in relation to any institutions in England, did so in ignorance, and without at all knowing the horrible character of slavery in the United States. He took up a paper the other day in which the writer, commenting on the recent formation in this country of an Anti-Slavery League, having for its object the overthrow of slavery throughout the world, spoke of "political slavery in England." He spoke of slavery in the army, slavery in the navy, and, looking upon the labouring population, he contemplated them as slaves. He then asked, "Why does not England set the example by doing away with these forms of slavery at home, before it called upon the United States to do so?" He (Mr. Douglass) had not one word to say in defence of any form of oppression on earth—not a sentence in extenuation of the conduct of any tyrant on earth. His wish, his prayer was, that tyranny and oppression of every kind might have an end (cheers). Yet was he there boldly to proclaim that there was no more similarity between slavery, as existing in the United States, and any institution in this country, than there was between light and darkness. Only look at the condition of the slave: stripped of every right—denied every privilege, he had not even the privilege of saying "myself"—his head, his eyes, his hands, his heart, his bones, his sinews, his soul, his immortal spirit, were all the property of another. He might not decide any question for himself—any question relating to his own actions. The master—the man who claimed property in his person—assumed the right to decide all things for him—what he should eat, how he should eat, what he should drink; to whom he should speak, what he should speak; for whom he should work and under what circumstances; when he should marry, to whom he should marry, and how long the marriage covenant should continue, for they claimed the power of separating those who considered themselves joined together before God (hear). They took upon themselves to determine for the slave what was right and what was wrong, and they had a very different code of morals from that contained in the decalogue. If a slave used his hands to resist the violence of his master, he was a rebel, who might be knocked down and even killed. If he took his own earnings, he stole, and might be whipped as a thief. If he asserted his right to his own person, he committed the highest crime, and might suffer death. If he loved his wife, and chose not to be separated from her at the will of his master, he was a traitor and an outlaw. The slave had no interest in himself—he had no right to himself—he was a mere thing to be bought and sold at the will of his master—he could have no more information than was compatible with the will of his master. God had given him an intellect, but he might not improve it. God had given him a soul, but he might not seek its salvation in the way his conscience and his moral perceptions might suggest. God had given him a body, and certain powers to provide for it, yet he might be sold and maltreated, and he had no redress. He was a mere thing—a human brute, dragged down from the condition of a man and ranked with the brute creation. Were there any such in this country? No—not one (hear). They had their rags and their poverty, their hard toiling for a subsistence, as also they had in the northern states of America, but they had not slavery (cheers). No man could assert over another the right of property—he was free to act—free to go and free to come; but the slave was bound in unending chains—he could not improve, progress was annihilated with him. It had been said by one who had written most intellectually as to what happiness consisted in, that progress was the great cause and main-spring of happiness in the human family—the improvement and expansion of our faculties. In the United States there were three millions of human beings who were denied the right to improve themselves; the more like brutes they could be made, the more beastly in their habits they could be made, the better were the wishes of the master accomplished—for his desire was to break up as far as possible all likeness to mankind on the part of the slave. For this purpose they divided families; for this purpose they took the infant from the mother before it had the power of knowing her; for this purpose they made it penal for a slave to be taught his letters, penal to ward off the blow aimed at him by the whiteman. They made it punishable with death for a woman to protect herself from the violence of her master. In that country a slave woman was left utterly unprotected—she had no defence—the slave-owner could do what he pleased, and if a woman tried to defend her person from the brutal outrage of an unfeeling master, she might be struck to the earth and killed on the spot. These were hard sayings, and few perhaps might be ready to believe those things to be true. Their incredulity was creditable to them as Englishmen and as Christians. Such atrocities were abhorrent to their feelings as men; so abominable in their view as Christians, that they could not bring themselves to believe such statements. The Americans, they would say, were men. Yes, they were men, but bad men, men corrupted through a long series of years, accustomed to such brutal outrages on the black population, that they would commit any atrocity on the persons of the slaves without remorse. But they in England would not believe these things, because the Americans were a nation of professing Christians. In the professing Christianity of the United States was to be found the cause of the continuance of slavery. The clergy and the church in the United States were engaged in sending the gospel to the heathen; they contributed to send missionaries abroad, and were loud and long in their denunciation of the Roman Catholics because they said that church did not encourage the reading of the Bible by the laity, and yet the time had not come when a single church in the United States had made a single movement towards giving a single Bible to a slave (hear). Yes, they were a nation of professors. No other nation on the earth was so loud in its professions as the American people: their political professions were unbounded. They had heard of America, 3000 miles off, as the land of the free and the home of the brave; the asylum where the oppressed of all nations on the face of the globe could find refuge. Loud and long were their harangues on the 4th of July, the anniversary of their independence. Their declaration put forth that all men were born free, and were equally entitled to certain inalienable rights—to

life and liberty in the pursuit of happiness; that all just governments derived their right to govern from the people—and yet, under the very eave-droppings of their political institutions—under the very eave-droppings of their chapels, were heard the clank of the fetters and the rattling of the chains which bound their miserable slaves together, to be driven by the lash of their driver on board the ships for New Orleans, there to be sold in the market like brutes (cheers). Yes, they were a nation of professors, and if any one wished to find what their true character was, let him find what just the opposite of their professions was, and he would have it duly declared. Yes, they were a nation of Christian professors! Their ministers of religion, on each returning sabbath, greeted the presence of the Almighty with a lie on their lips. Their first salutation was, "We thank thee, O Lord, that we live in a land of civil and religious liberty." A land of civil and religious liberty, where three millions of people were deprived by stern enactment of the right to read the word of God! A land of civil and religious liberty, where three million of people were denied the right of marriage! A land of civil and religious liberty, where to train up the child in the way he should go was punishable with death! A land of civil and religious liberty, where three millions were in chains! A land of civil and religious liberty, where to keep a sabbath-school exposed the individual to imprisonment, chains, and death! (loud cheers.) A land of civil and religious liberty, where the Bible Society dared not circulate a single Bible among three millions of people! A land of civil and religious liberty, where to act on the principle of the gospel which they professed, and to do to others as they would be done by, was to incur the penalty of death! Was that a land of civil and religious liberty? And yet their ministers of religion cried amen to the prayer, and professed that America was the freest nation on the globe. Oh, yes, they did profess well. There were at the present time some 50 or 60 of those ministers in this country, and if his friend Mr. Garrison had no other reason for visiting England than to counteract the machinations of those men and resist their evil influence upon society, that reason alone would be an abundant one. The American churches were the main upholders of slavery. He did not mean to condemn the organisation of these churches, although their enemies would have the people believe that the abolitionists were infidels, atheists, and everything that was bad; and they made out, too, a very plausible story. They said "the abolitionists oppose us, the ministers of the most high God—they are opposed to the churches;" but they took good care to conceal the reason why they opposed them (hear, hear). They were opposed to the churches, but it was upon the principle upon which the prophet Isaiah was opposed to a false church in his days—he found her full of blood: there were solemn fasts and professions, but the church was full of blood, and the prophet opposed it. So, in the United States, they found bishops, and ministers, and members of churches dealing in slaves and supported by the traffic in slaves; and the abolitionists opposed the churches because they did not believe that the religion of Jesus Christ needed for its support a traffic in human flesh and blood (cheers). He regretted that it was so, and he had too much shrunk from attacking the church in America, more than he ought to have done. He begged pardon of his brethren in bonds for that shrinking from his duty. He would never shrink from it again (cheers). He meant, with God's aid, to lift up his voice—feeble though it was—against that church and against the ministers of that church, whoever they might be. He was bound to do that; he could not do otherwise without sacrificing the duty he had undertaken. The American churches had not taken a negative position in regard to the great question of slavery. Their sin was not like that of the priest and the levite, a sin of omission only, although that would have exposed them to condemnation. They had openly and boldly come forward in the support of slavery and slaveholding. The ministers of that church, when the politicians were defeated by the abolitionists in the arguments they advanced, sacrilegiously took up the Bible of truth, and quoted the word of the living God as an argument in favour of slavery—a system of wholesale concubinage, wholesale plunder, and wholesale murder—that system which, to use the language of John Wesley, was in itself the concentration of every abomination, was strenuously upheld and boldly defended by learned divines, reverend doctors, and whole presbyteries and synods in the United States. Such was the state of the case. The simple fact that, under the very eaves-droppings of the pulpits might be found the whip, the chains, the thumb-screws, and all the accursed paraphernalia of slavery—that all the instruments of bondage and oppression were to be met with in the very presence of the altar, unrebuked by the American churches, was enough to show the unchristian character of those churches. What they (the abolitionists) wanted, was to create in England such a horror of slavery and of a slave-holding religion, as that the members of Christian churches in England might be led to disclaim any denominational fellowship with the churches of the United States (hear). And why should this not be done—could any one give a reason? Who wanted to hold fellowship with a man-stealer? (hear, hear) and was not a slaveholder a man-stealer? But the churches wanted to turn the tables on him (Douglass) and said he was a man-stealer. How did the meeting think they made out their case? They said that he had stolen himself from his master (a laugh); that the government of the United States had solemnly guaranteed to his master a right of property in his body; and that, in the face of that solemn obligation—in the face of that solemn enactment of the sovereign people of the United States—he had run off with himself (applause and laughter). And they were calling upon him to come back, and telling him that his master was terribly enraged with him, and considered that no punishment would be too bad for him, because he had committed the awful theft of stealing his own body, and his own hands, and of appropriating them to himself, an individual in England. Those slaveholders in America had so nice a sense of justice, that they could detect theft anywhere, except in the right place (laughter and cheers). They called him, then, a thief, and he was endeavouring to turn the joke upon them, and to prove that instead of upon him the charge fastened upon them. And he wanted the Christian people of England to exclude from Christian communion with them all who were slaveholders, all who participated in the inhuman traffic, and all who apologised for slavery. And why not? Were they to admit into communion with them the man who had deprived another of his right? Would they admit a sheep-stealer, or one who apologised for sheep-stealing? Would they not be afraid, as O'Connell once said, that he would put his theory into practice. Such a one called on Mr. O'Connell once. "Are you a slaveowner?" said O'Connell; "No, sir," replied his visitor from the Northern States, "but I will discuss the question with you." "Discuss the question!" said O'Connell, "would I discuss the propriety of picking pockets with a man? no, sir, I should show him the door, lest he put his theory into practice" (cheers). So he (Mr. D.) would say to them when any one wanted to discuss the propriety of slavery. Clearly they would not admit a sheep-stealer to their fellowship—why, then, should they be more gracious or more complaisant to a man-stealer? He was aware that there were in England a set of very feeling people who felt very much for the slaveholder. They pleaded for him that he had been brought up a slaveholder—that his early habits were slaveholding—that all his property was vested in slaves—and that, relying on the fruits of their labour, he had been brought up in such a delicate manner that he was unfitted for any kind of business (hear). This kind of sympathy they had to contend with in the United States; but it was sympathy without justice—a sort of wrong-sided sympathy—a sympathy for the man who knocked you down and trampled upon you; but none at all with the man who was knocked down and trampled upon (cheers). In all their considerations of the question—in all their communications with America upon it, they should always remember the slaves. It was a wise saying of the apostle, "Remember them in bonds as bound with you." The fault was that many sympathised with the slaveholders while they thought nothing of the long series of years during which the poor slaves had been deprived of their own property—and not only of the right to their own property, but of the right to their own bodies, hands, arms, and intellect (cheers). Let them henceforth treat the slaveholder as a man-stealer, and refuse communion with him. Some sinners they might admit to their churches, in the hope of inducing in them a conviction of their sin; but the slaveholder was a peculiar kind of sinner. He was not like the publican who smote his breast and cried to God for mercy; but he was a proud, obdurate, hardened, daring sinner—a sinner who gloried in his sin, and who was prepared to hold up his head anywhere in the sight of God and man and declare that he was a slaveholder. The abolitionists wanted to humble him—they knew that the only chance of saving him from himself was to humble him, and they believed that the best way of doing it would be to exclude him from the communion of the church—to set the brand of Cain upon him and mark him out as a vagabond. And was he not a vagabond—when he would, without remorse, steal yon bright-eyed boy (pointing to a child among the audience), tear him from his mother's arms, deny him the right to cultivate his intellect, doom him to slavery and ignorance, and force him to drag his chains and fetters under the degrading torture of the lash? (loud cheers.) If there was such a man, ought he not to be branded with the mark of crime? ought he not to be marked as a villain, a vagabond? And such was every slaveholder. The slaveholder had no wish to be confined to black men; he would steal white men as readily as a man who stole a black horse would not scruple to steal a white horse. The slave had all the sensibilities of a white man. He felt the lash on his back as keenly—he felt as strongly as the white man the curse of slavery—and the only reason why he did not forcibly emancipate himself was because he saw himself surrounded by an overwhelming power—by a community which had resolved that the poor slave must either remain a slave or die (hear)—that the moment he attempted to become a freeman the whole nation should set upon him and kill him, or hunt him down and restore him to the bondage of his master. The speaker then referred to the rapid progress of the abolition cause in the United States, and particularly acknowledged the great advantages which had resulted from the unceasing efforts of Mr. Garrison, and from the formation of ladies' auxiliaries. As one of the whip-scourged slaves, he tendered to them his most grateful acknowledgments. One great means of overthrowing slavery was by diffusing light on the subject; for this purpose funds were required, without which they could neither print books nor circulate them. To supply

these funds an annual bazaar was held in Boston. The receipts, which the first year were only 300 dollars, had increased last year to 3000 or 4000 dollars; and if the ladies of England wished to serve the cause, they could best do so by contributing towards this bazaar (cheers). The cause never was in a more hopeful condition than at present; the feeling in favour of "no union with slave states" was spreading through the country, and when that feeling should be universal in the north, slavery must cease. Let the north but say to the slave states, "Freedom can have no communion with slavery; if you will traffic in human flesh and blood, we will not be partakers of your iniquity. If you will invoke the vengeance of your offended God, the blood be on your own heads—if you will goad the slaves to fire and fury, on you be the consequences of your folly and your crime." When the north should say this to the south, the doom of slavery would be fixed, for the slaveholder would become too weak to hold the slave in bondage (applause). To promote the growth of this feeling was what was sought. Let the pulpit speak out—let the press speak out against slavery—let them heed not the revilings of the slaveholders (hear). He knew that O'Connell was the friend of the negro, because the slaveholders denounced him—he knew that Garrison was the friend of his race, because he heard them curse him (hear). They knew full well whom to curse and whom to praise. After some further remarks, Mr. Douglass concluded by saying that God was on the side of freedom, and the abolitionists must prevail. The conclusion of his truly eloquent and forcible address, which had been listened so with the most marked interest throughout, was greeted with long-continued cheering.

The Mayor again addressed the meeting, stating that they were bound to return their cordial thanks to Messrs. Garrison and Douglass, for the interesting statements they had given them, and to express a hope that their labours in the cause of the slave might meet with responsive sympathy in this city. In deciding upon visiting Bristol these gentlemen had not miscalculated upon finding here a considerable amount of anti-slavery zeal. Besides the active part which Bristol took in the abolition of the slave trade, and in the emancipation of the negroes in the West Indies, ample evidence of the interest felt for the coloured race in America was afforded in 1840, when the Rev. J. Keep, of Ohio (as he found on reference to the proceedings which then occurred), came hither to raise money for the Oberlin Institute, on which occasion he found Mr. Keep collected, from persons of all shades of religious and political opinions in this city, no less than 500 guineas! The object, however, of Messrs. Garrison and Douglass was not to obtain money, but to give information; they declined accepting any remuneration for their services. Those who were desirous of aiding, by contributions, the anti-slavery cause, may do so by supporting the new society which has just been formed in London; or by furnishing articles to the bazaar annually held in Boston, an account of which (as well as the names of the ladies who receive contributions for this city) was given at the end of "Frederick Douglass's Narrative," and also in a tract lately published in this city, entitled, "A brief Notice of American Slavery, and the Abolition Movement." He was sure he would be excused for observing that, though no charge had been made for admittance to the meeting, certain expenses had been necessarily incurred, and that it would be unreasonable for them to fall upon the gentlemen who had kindly undertaken the trouble of making the various arrangements; for defraying those expenses a collection would be made at the door. In the name and on the behalf of the ladies and gentlemen now assembled, he begged leave to return their best thanks for the attendance of Messrs. Garrison and Douglass, and for their exposition.

The thanks of the meeting were then voted to the Mayor for his kindness in taking the chair, and the proceedings terminated.

A second meeting was held on Wednesday evening, at the Public-rooms, Broadmead, when the chair was taken by George Thomas, Esq., who, together with Messrs. Garrison and Douglass, addressed the assembly. As the main features of the meeting were similar to those noticed above, a report of the speeches is unnecessary. In order to give another hearing to Mr. Douglass, and to pass sundry resolutions on the subject, another meeting was announced for Wednesday next. At the conclusion of the meeting a vote of thanks was passed to Messrs. Douglass and Garrison, whose addresses were greeted by repeated plaudits.

Frederick Douglass.—So intense was the interest with which this remarkable man was listened to at the Victoria and the Broadmead rooms, that he has been requested to address a Bristol audience for the third time, as will be seen by advertisement. On this occasion Mr. D. will explain how slavery is upheld, owing to the respectability conferred upon it by the religious bodies of America. The position he laid down on Wednesday evening (which did not seem to be clearly understood), was simply that those churches in America which practice or sanction the gross immorality of selling men, women, and children to pay their clergymen, to purchase communion plate, and to buy Bibles (while the giving one of those Bibles to a slave is punished as a crime), ought not to have their ministers welcomed to the pulpits of those of their own denominations in Great Britain.—*(Communicated.)*

Slavery and Methodism.—A large convention of members of several of the local conferences of the Methodist Evangelical Church, at Cincinnati and its vicinity, was lately held, in consequence of the action of the late general conference of the Methodist Protestant Church on the above question. A series of resolutions were unanimously adopted, disapproving the action of the conference on said question, recommending to the quarterly conference of the several circuits and stations of the Ohio annual conference to take into consideration the propriety of withdrawing fellowship from the slave-holders' portion of the church, and of instructing the delegates to the next annual conference accordingly. They also resolved that, in case the Ohio conference refused to withdraw, they would withdraw themselves.—*New York Evangelist.*

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Agreeably to the unanimous wish of the Meeting held in the PUBLIC-ROOMS, BROADMEAD, on Wednesday Evening,

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, the Fugitive Slave,

Has consented, on his return from Exeter, to be present at another MEETING on WEDNESDAY Next, Sept. 2, at the same Rooms, when he will address the audience upon Slavery in the United States, and will especially refer to the support afforded to Slaveholding by the conduct of the American Churches.

It is purposed, on this occasion, to pass some Resolutions of sympathy with the American Abolitionists, and to form a Society auxiliary to the Anti-Slavery League.

The Chair will be taken by GEORGE THOMAS, Esq., at Seven o'clock.

Tickets for the Side Galleries, 6d.; for the Body of the Room, 2d.; to be had of H. C. Evans, 29, Clare-street; J. Ackland, Dolphin-street; and J. Faulder, King-square-avenue.

An early application for Tickets is recommended to those anxious to be present.

"The Narrative of Frederick Douglass," price 2s. 6d., and the "Brief Notice of American Slavery and the Abolition Movement," price 3d., may be had at Mr. Evans's, 29, Clare-street; or at the Broadmead-Rooms, after the Meeting.

APPEAL FOR THE SLAVE.

BY WHITTIER, AN AMERICAN POET.

"Our countrymen in chains!"

"Genius of America! Spirit of Free Institutions! where art thou? How art thou fallen. O, Lucifer! Son of the Morning! how art thou fallen from heaven! Hell from beneath is moved for thee, to meet thee at thy coming! The kings of the earth cry out to thee—'Aha! Aha! art thou become like unto us?'"

Our fellow-countrymen in chains!
Slaves, in a land of light and law!
Slaves, crouching on the very plains
Where roll'd the storm of Freedom's war!
A groan from Eutaw's haunted wood—
A wail where Camden's martyrs fell,
By every shrine of patriot blood,
From Moultrie's wall and Jasper's well!

By storied hill and hallow'd grot—
By mossy wood and marshy glen,
Whence rang of old the rifle shot,
And hurrying shout of Marion's men;
The groan of breaking hearts is there—
The falling lash, the fetter's clank!
Slaves—slaves are breathing in that air
Which old De Kalb and Sumter drank!

What, ho! *our* countrymen in chains!
The whip on *woman's* shrinking flesh!
Our soil yet reddening with the stains
Caught from her scourging, warm and fresh!
What! mothers from their children riven!
What! God's own image bought and sold!
Americans to market driven,
And barter'd (as the brute) for gold!

Speak! shall their agony of prayer
Come thrilling to our hearts in vain?
To us, whose fathers scorn'd to bear
The paltry *menace* of a chain—
To us whose boast is, loud and long,
Of holy liberty and light:
Say, shall these writhing slaves of wrong
Plead vainly for their plunder'd right?

What! shall we send, with lavish breath,
Our sympathies across the wave,
Where manhood, on the field of death,
Strikes for his freedom, or a grave?
Shall prayers go up, and hymns be sung
For Greece, the Moslem fetter spurning,
And millions hail, with pen and tongue,
Our light on all her altars burning?

Shall Belgium feel, and gallant France,
By Vendôme's pile, and Schoenbrun's wall,
And Poland, gasping on her lance,
The impulse of our cheering call?
And shall the slave, beneath our eye,
Clank o'er *our* fields his hateful chain?
And toss his fetter'd arms on high,
And groan for Freedom's gift in vain?

Oh, say, shall Prussia's banner be
A refuge for the stricken slave?
And shall the Russian serf go free
By Baikal's lake and Neva's wave?
And shall the wintry-bosom'd Dane
Relax the iron hand of pride,
And bid his bondman cast the chain,
From fetter'd soul and limb, aside?

Shall every flap of England's flag
Proclaim that all around are free,
From "farthest Ind" to each blue crag
That beetles o'er the western sea?
And shall we scoff at Europe's kings,
When Freedom's fire is dim with us?
And round our country's altar clings
The damning shade of Slavery's curse?

Go—let us ask of Constantine
To loose his grasp on Poland's throat;
And beg the lord of Mahmoud's line
To spare the struggling Suliote—
Will not the scorching answer come
From turban'd Turk and fiery Russ,
"Go, loose your fetter'd slaves at home,
Then turn, and ask the like of us!"

Just God! and shall we calmly rest,
The Christian's scorn—the Heathen's mirth;
Content to live the lingering jest
And byword of a mocking earth?
Shall our own glorious land retain
That curse which Europe scorns to wear?
Shall our own brethren drag the chain
Which not even Russia's menials wear?

Up, then, in Freedom's manly part,
From graybeard old to fiery youth;
And, on the nation's naked heart,
Scatter the living coals of truth!
Up! while ye slumber deeper yet
The shadow of our fame is growing!
Up! while ye pause our sun may set
In blood, around our altars flowing!

Oh, rouse ye, ere the storm comes forth—
The gather'd wrath of God and man—
Like that which wasted Egypt's earth,
When hail and fire above it ran.
Hear ye no warnings in the air?
Feel ye no earthquake underneath?
Up—up! why will ye slumber where
The sleeper only wakes in death?

Up *now* for Freedom! not in strife
Like that your sterner fathers saw:
The awful waste of human life—
The glory and the guilt of war;
But break the chain, the yoke remove,
And smite to earth Oppression's rod,
With those mild arms of Truth and Love,
Made mighty through the living God!

Down let the shrine of Moloch sink,
And leave no traces where it stood;
No longer let its idol drink
His daily cup of human blood;
But rear another altar there,
To Truth, and Love, and Mercy given;
And Freedom's gift and Freedom's prayer
Shall call an answer down from heaven!

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

We report in our paper of this week, a brief outline of one of the most important, unanimous, and decided public meetings which this city ever witnessed. The topic was American Slavery, and the speakers were some of our leading liberal citizens, and two visitors from the United States, one being William Lloyd Garrison, who is, we believe, the father of the Anti-slavery movement in the United States, the other Frederick Douglass, formerly a slave, who has escaped from the thraldom of slavery by flight, and having educated himself, now devotes his talents and energies to the cause of his oppressed brethren. The temper of the meeting will be best evinced by the resolutions which were adopted, and which were all carried unanimously. We are no great advocates for the intrusion of one nation into the domestic affairs of another; but Slavery is so terrible a blot upon the character of our common christianity—is a sin of so deep a dye—an enormity of so unspeakable a character—that any just influence which the public opinion of one state, can bring to bear upon the people of another, in order to work out its emancipation, is not only allowable, but is an actual duty. We hope that any Americans into whose hands this paper may fall, will look at the question calmly and deliberately—that they will not think that the people of Exeter are intermeddling improperly in their affairs; but that they are animated by a spirit of pure benevolence and enlightened philanthropy; well assured that the Slave-owner is not only punished by the profitless anxiety to which this system subjects him, but by the countless terrors which are heaped up for him and his successors in the immediate future. One cannot behold the system of Slavery as it exists in the Southern States of America, where the coloured population extends so rapidly, and comes into so close a contact with the civilization and knowledge of the white; without forseeing that before long the system will explode and overwhelm all orders of society in a bloody convulsion—unless God should be pleased to avert the catastrophe, by enabling the American people to see the consequence of their unjust and sanguinary laws respecting slaves. Their vain attempt to surpress every feeling of sympathy on their behalf makes them objects of contempt and reprobation with all Christian nations. When we consider their boasted declaration of independence, in which they lay down as a self evident truth, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an unalienable right to liberty—they must think that the whole of Christendom must be as blind as they are hypocritical and canting, if we do not point to this declaration of independence and contrast with it the institution of Slavery. They profess to have the deepest repugnance to a union of the two races: but a large mass of the slave population are the offspring of that very union which they hold in such conventional abhorrence. Many of these slaves owners thus sell into hopeless captivity their own sons and daughters—this Frederick Douglass, whose eloquent language has excited such deep feelings of indignation against the American slave owners, is supposed to be the offspring of his own master by one of his female slaves. If he be an average specimen of what this portion of the slave population would become under proper training, there can be no doubt that the system contains within itself the germ of its own violent destruction. Every good Christian will pray however that so awful a convulsion may be avoided, and that the American people may be brought by timely reflection to understand the position in which they are placed before all civilized humanity, and come forward as the British people did, and by a present sacrifice, purchase a lasting and an honorable renown.

Western Times Sep. 5. 1846

Wn. Times Sep. 5. 1846

SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

A very numerous and respectable meeting was held at the Subscription Rooms, on Friday evening last, convened by public announcement, to consider the question of American Slavery. The room was densely crowded in every part, the great object of attraction being the celebrated abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, and Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave. The powerful eloquence of both these able speakers, and the dreadful narratives which they gave of that monster abomination and national iniquity, *American Slavery*, excited the profoundest sensation.

The proceedings commenced by

Mr. Wilkinson moving that Mr. J. C. Sercombe be requested to preside, which was carried by acclamation.

The Chairman said that nothing but the pressing request of a number of gentlemen, his friends, who were anxious to shew that the religious public in Exeter generally took up the great cause of abolitionism in America had induced him to take the chair. It was

however thought necessary that persons of every religious denomination should take part in this demonstration, and enter their solemn protest against American slavery. The object of their meeting was to consider specially the slavery of the United States, and he was glad to see many a friend with whom, in times gone by, he had worked, and met week after week until at last they succeeded in pulling down for ever slavery in the West Indies—(cheers). They had now met to affirm that great principle, that man ought to be free all over the world—(cheers). After some further observations on the gross inconsistency of the United States, professing to be the freest country in the world, and yet supporting, as one of their institutions, a system of slavery more atrocious than the world ever saw: he concluded by calling on the Rev. F. Bishop to move the first resolution.

The Rev. Francis Bishop rose and said: the resolution he had to propose was one he was quite sure would receive their hearty support. It was to welcome to this city, and to hold out the right hand of fellowship to William Lloyd Garrison, of the United States, and to Frederick Douglass, an emancipated bondsman, from the same country—(cheers)—the eloquent advocates of the cause of freedom for three millions of their fellow men now held as slaves in the United States, and to bid them God speed in their glorious cause—(cheers). William Lloyd Garrison's name is known throughout the United States—known to be loved, he might say revered by the slave, and the friend of the slave, and to be execrated and cast out as evil by the oppressors of the slave and their abettors. He was, as they were aware, the president of the American Anti-Slavery Society; and not only the president, but he was the originator of the abolition movement in the United States, and was the first to promulgate the doctrine of the immediate emancipation of the slave—(cheers). They had the authority of one who had the opportunity of personally observing, to a very large extent, the state of society in America, and who had written largely and well on that subject, for saying that the man of colour and the slaves adored him, and that the blessing of the slaves and the slaves' friends follow in his path. About 16 or 17 years ago, the utmost indifference prevailed in the United States respecting that horrific and iniquitous system. That from two to three millions of our fellow beings were reduced to the conditions of personal chattels, excited no attention—no voice was raised against it—no influential combination threatened its stability—all was indifference, all inaction. William Lloyd Garrison, then a youth, was struck with the sinfulness of this state of things, he felt his soul aroused, and his sympathies awakened, in favour of the oppressed slave, and he nobly determined to devote his life to the cause of the slave's emancipation, and to awake his countrymen to a sense of their iniquity—(cheers). No sooner had he made public his intention, and attempted to influence the people by lectures and writings through the press, than the hand of persecution was raised against him. The union was moved from its centre to its circumference, and the people were every where excited against him. He received letters from the southern states, containing the most atrocious threats, accompanied by pictures representing a human being, hung by the neck until he was dead; and assuring him that the bowie knife was ready for him. It was a common topic of conversation that William Lloyd Garrison would ere long be assassinated—still his noble spirit quailed not, and though cast into prison—the same where that noble hearted man, the Rev. Mr. Torry, an independent minister, was afterwards confined, and who was martyred (having died in prison) for giving refuge to a fugitive slave—he would not prove recreant to the cause. He was put in prison at Baltimore for speaking the truth in reference to the conduct of a slave owner to his slave. His spirit was still unquelled, his zeal undaunted—his aspiration still rose from his prison cell in favour of the oppressed, and when at length liberated from prison he left on the walls of his cell the following beautiful record of the feeling which animated his mind—

I boast no courage on the battle field,
  Where hostile troops immix in horrid fray;
For love of fame I can no weapon yield,
  With burning lust an enemy to slay.
But test my spirit at the blazing stake,
  For advocacy of the rights of man
And truth—or on the wheel my body break;
  Let persecution place me 'neath its ban;
Insult, defame, proscribe, my humble name:
  Yea, put the dagger at my naked breast;
If I recoil in terror from the flame—
  Or recreant prove when peril rears its crest,
To save a limb or shun the public scorn,
Then write me down for aye—*weakest of women born.*

—(loud applause.) Soon after his liberation Mr. Garrison started a newspaper—his means were not large, and he (the rev. speaker) believed he was not letting out a secret when he told them that, in order to carry it on, he, for some time, lived in a garrett on bread and water—(hear, hear, and cheers). His was, indeed, a self-sacrificing spirit, recommended to us, and exemplified before us, by our common Saviour. They well knew who it was said, "by their fruits ye shall know them," and well had he proved his zeal and benevolence and philanthropy. Mr. Garrison had been blamed for using harsh language—he would, therefore, read a passage from the first number of the *Liberator*, in which he justifies himself, as it was always his constant principle to call things by their right names. He says "I am aware that many will object to the severity of my language. Is there not cause? I will be as harsh as truth, as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think or write with moderation; tell a man whose house is on fire to give moderate help, and tell me to be moderate in this cause. I will be heard." "I will be heard"—such was the prophetic declaration of William Lloyd Garrison on the 1st of January, 1831. He has been heard—his voice has been heard by the slave, and has carried support to his down trodden soul. It has been heard by the slave owner, and has caused him to fear that his unholy and unrighteous system shall be put an end to. It has been heard by the friends of humanity—everywhere has his dauntless spirit spread. His noble career, his pure faith that his cause is the cause of God, and of justice, of humanity, and of truth, is everywhere taking root. It has nerved the weak, encouraged the timid, cheered the brave, and excited us all to more animated exertions in the holy cause of humanity and freedom—(cheers). We welcome him—(a tremendous burst of applause.) We welcome him to this meeting. We tell him we wish him God speed—(renewed cheering). That our fervent prayer is that his valuable life may long be spared—and that he may live to see the blessed fulfilment of labours so nobly commenced, so consistently carried on—(cheers). Of our brother to my right what shall I say of him. You will all respond to the declaration, when I say, "We welcome Frederick Douglass"—(immense cheering)—the self-emancipated bondsman—the eloquent asserter of the rights of humanity—the living refutation of those who contend for the natural inferiority of our coloured brethren—(cheers). We welcome him. He will have not merely our good wishes, but our earnest practical sympathy, our practical support, and in any way in which we can consistently aid both our friends we shall be happy to do so—(cheers). I will not detain you longer except to express the hope that we shall soon see that glorious consummation when the fetters shall be struck from the limbs of the slave, and this fearful pest on the people of America be suffered no longer to exist. The reverend gentleman then read the resolution, and resumed his seat amid much applause.

R. T. Abraham, Esq., solicitor, briefly seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Chairman then introduced

William Lloyd Garrison, who was received with enthusiastic shouts of welcome. He is indeed an extraordinary man—no one could ever casually look at his grave and thoughtful countenance, beaming with love, and tinctured with a shade of profound melancholy, without feelings of the deepest interest. Although under 40, his head is quite bald, and he bears strong traces on his countenance, of the severe intellectual labor he has gone through. So benignant is his appearance, that it is said, a southern slave-owner once bought an engraved portrait of him, to which no name was attached, framed it, and hung it up for a year or two in his house, struck with the benignant aspect which it exhibited, and showing it to his friends as the ideal of pure humanity. When however he found whose portrait it was, it was at once destroyed. His voice is clear, calm and modulated, in the most harmonious tone, and inspired a feeling in his hearers of veneration and awe. It may be said of him that he has the courage of a hero, the fortitude of a martyr, the piety of a saint, and the zeal of an apostle. The cheering having subsided, he said that he had been taken by surprise on the present occasion, as he came not to the meeting to hear any panegyric on his humble labors in the United States. in the cause of abolition. He could more easily encounter an American mob, than he could receive panegyrics which he did not deserve. But their welcome was gratifying, because he was conscious that they were on the side of emancipation, and the knowledge that they had washed their own hands at last in innocence, with regard to slavery in their colonies, all these things filled his soul with joy and gratitude—(cheers). How different was it on the other side of the Atlantic; there, there were but few to plead in favor of the slaves emancipation—but few addresses were

delivered in favor of the liberty of man. There the uncompromising champion of emancipation, must be prepared to lose his character, and his good name; to make himself of no reputation—to be treated as the noble army of martyrs and confessors had been treated of old; to have nothing to cheer him in his rugged path, but his faith in God, and in the righteousness of his cause; and though assailed and persecuted, that faith and trust had never forsaken him. He took no credit to himself that he had been the pioneer in the Anti-slavery movement in the United States. He who should come to them with a true [illegible] hour, should also receive his reward and be joyfully accepted. "Not unto us, but unto thee, Oh Lord be all the glory"—(loud cheers). He felt happy to be in this land of England, where no slave can exist—here the declaration of the poet is not an hypothetical allusion but a sober truth. Slaves cannot breathe in England—(cheers). If their lungs inhale its air, that moment they are free—they touch your country's soil, their shackles fall from them. Would to God, said Mr. Garrison, it was so in the land of my nativity. Oh, how does it happen that it is not so—that the people who in 1776 rose up in vindication of man's rights, and separated from the mother country in the name of liberty, are now the people who of all people on the face of the earth, are the greatest slave-owners, and consequently the worst of hypocrites. Why is it, as our respected chairman asks, that these things are in that boasted land of liberty the United States. Sir, it is because they who thus undertook to declare their regard for liberty, were not sincere in that declaration—they did not take the whole human race into their consideration—when they declared that self evident truth, that God had made all men equal—(cheers). At that moment they were aspersing the cause of justice and truth, for their slaves chains were clanking around them—(cheers). At the time they were declaring that all men were equal, they held half a million of human beings as slaves. From that hour to the present moment, they have bent all their energies towards increasing the number of their victims, and spreading slavery and the slave-trade. For this, am I here to night to ask you, to lift up your voice against the land of my birth—not to reproach them in an evil spirit, but to bear righteous testimony against the people of that land, as denying christian truth—acting in opposition to their own boasted republican professions, and embarrassing the march of liberty throughout the world—(cheers). I rejoice that in regard to this great cause of humanity, that it is indeed a broad one, it is not sectarian, it is not national. No. Overleaping all these distinctions; passing by all these boundaries, of sect, or creed, or nation, or colour, I say "my country is the world, and my countrymen are all mankind"—(great cheering). I am then no foreigner on this question, I come to you as a brother, as a countryman, a member of the same common family—having the same father over us, the same Redeemer to lead us to happiness and immortality hereafter—(loud cheers). He then went on to give some particulars as to the rapid increase of slavery in America. At the time of the declaration of independence, the number of slaves was about 500,000 their market value about 200 million of dollars; at the present time their number is about three million, and their market value 1,500 millions of dollars. When the constitution was formed in the United States, they had seven free states, to six slave states; now they have 15 slave states, and only 13 free; thus it will be seen that slavery is increasing with frightful rapidity. America is almost entirely under the control of the slave powers. Whether they turned to the state government or to the internal and domestic governments of the country, they were altogether controlled by the slave owners, public opinion was with them, and no man could be popular or successful in that country, who did not bow down and worship this slave holding Moloch. At the time of the separation in 1787, when the Colonies became independent, it was agreed by congress that slavery should be for ever prohibited in the North, and North Eastern states: but should be allowed in the South and South Western. But the desire of the slave owners to extend their territory was always insatiable, and they cast about for an opportunity of increasing it. This was afforded them by the purchase of Louisania from the French, during the administration of Thomas Jefferson in 1804, and that colony, although admitted into the Union as a single slave state, is of such enormous extent, that it can be subdivided into several states as large as Massachusets, and this subdivision is a trick which the slave owners well understand, as they found it a convenient mode of increasing their influence in the state legislature. He then referred to Florida, which was the next country obtained by America, still for the same purpose, the extension of slavery—and then he came to Texas. He had not time to go into the whole of this nefarious transaction—the annexation of Texas, he said, was in his opinion, one of the most dreadful deeds ever consummated since man was placed on the earth. It appeared that in 1829, Mexico passed a decree for ever abolishing slavery in her dominions—this excited the ire of the slave owners of free America, and from that moment Texas was doomed. A number of Americans established themselves illegally in that country, then declared themselves independent of the mother country Mexico—and then annexed themselves to the United States, Mexico being too weak to prevent it, for the express purpose of extending the horrid system of slavery, and of re-establishing it in that vast country. Thus it is, said Mr. Garrison, that the cause of liberty is trampled under foot, and broad as our country is, no man can go into any part of it, but he will have to confront the demon of slavery. Let him go into our Northern States, or our remotest provinces, there he will meet the demon, and if he speak on behalf of the slave, it is at the peril of his character, or his life. Let him go anywhere, he will find it not only omnipresent, but omnipotent and omniscient. I ask then, is it surprising that so few can be found willing to suffer the loss of all things dear to them, and to lay down life itself, that his country may be redeemed. I speak not in behalf of myself, but I have done what I could—thank God I believe that the terms of that resolution are true. If I did not know that I have never faltered, never compromised, never turned my back on the enemy, I should blush to stand here—(loud cheers). The slave owner I know will not say that I have yielded; and I am sure that the poor bleeding broken-hearted slave will never say it, of the the brave men and the glorious women who are associated with me; the truest of the true on earth—they belong to those of whom the world is not worthy—united as they are calumniated as they are—yet passing through the fire, and going through the flood, and coming out of all trials and tribulations rejoicing with the song of victory—(loud cheers). They would not wonder at the growth of slavery, when he told them that it was part of the original law, under which the federation was formed, that it was incorporated into the rational government, and that to overthrow it, the national government must be overthrown. He explained that at the time of the war of independence, there were two great parties, the free states and the slaves states; these states could have no interest in common more than Christ with Belial; yet, having no faith in the ultimate triumph of truth and justice—the Northern States from a fear of being reduced by England, entered into an agreement, by which they were bound hand and foot to the support of slavery, engaging themselves to do nothing to put down slavery, and pledging themselves that no spot in the whole union should be safe for the escaped slave, who was to be delivered up to his master wherever he might be found; and thus becoming the prison-keepers to the slave owners. That agreement was made 60 years since, and they have been faithful in carrying out this horrible pledge to the letter. Hence the American abolitionist finds himself reduced to this extremity; either to turn his back on the Anti-slavery cause, or no longer to stand by the constitution; for to uphold that pledge would be to involve themselves in the guilt of the slavery system. They had taken their choice, and declared themselves as far as the government were concerned "moral revolutionists." They would have no union with the slave owners religious or political. It was the strong arm of the North, which enabled the slave states to keep three millions of people in chains. If the struggle were only between the slaves and the slave owners, the two hundred and fifty thousand, or perhaps three hundred thousand masters on the one hand, and the three million slaves, armed with the conciousness of right on the other, how long would the struggle last? A struggle for liberty against the most cruel, the most cowardly oppressors of all men on the face of the earth. It was the strength of the North which would crush to the dust every attempt of the slave to obtain his freedom, and make slavery interminable amongst them. Were they not friends of humanity—friends of God and of Christianity, when they said they would not longer uphold that blood-stained Government? He then went on to notice the arrogant and aggressive system pursued by the United States in reference to their foreign policy—they would not be content with Mexico. Already they were fomenting, by means of their emissaries, divisions between the descendants of the French and Spanish colonists of Hayti. Cuba was watched with a jealous eye by these slave owners; it was a settled design of America to seize Cuba. There was no limit to the ambition of these slave owners, they meant to subject the world if they could—(hear, hear). They had bought Louisania, stolen Texas, and were now claiming Mexico as their own; and yet theirs was "the land of the free and the home of the brave" and every 4th of July they sent up their prayers to heaven, and thanked God that he had made all men equal. He knew of no hypocrisy in any nation equal to this people's—their hearts were become adamant—

could they believe in God or have any faith in Christianity. They could not be republicans—slavery is not the legitimate child of republicanism, which says that all men are created free and equal. How then could slavery, which tramples on human rights, and degrades the image of man into a beast, be the child of a republic. He would now refer to a few prominent features of American slavery—he did so because he was satisfied that few in this country comprehended what American slavery meant. He found many persons very sensitive when slave holders were charged with being thieves, robbers, and man stealers, and they considered they were rather in the light of unfortunate men, who did not know they were perpetrating a great crime. Such was too much the feeling in the United States itself—there slavery was become a household word; it met with no condemnation, and it was slave owners who furnished their statesmen—received their votes—were doctors in divinity, and preachers in their pulpits—(cheers). But that single word comprehended a description of men who were of all men the most guilty, the most abominable under the sun, and their unhallowed system led to practices the most dreadful, the most cruel that the world ever heard off. Since he had been in this country he had heard people talk of the famishing condition of the poor man here, and say we have enough slavery in England, why need we trouble ourselves about this slavery which is three thousand miles off. Now any man who says that there is slavery in this country is either ignorant of what is meant by slavery, or he is a hypocrite—(cheers). Any man who attempts to run parallel between the poorest of the poor in England, and the best fed slave in America, and gives a verdict in favour of the slave, shows that he is dead to every feeling of liberty and fit to be himself a slave—(cheers). He was not there to apologise for British oppression, of which there might be too much—his heart bled for the suffering millions of this country—(cheers). But what did they gain by falsehood. Nothing. Show him the poorest man in the kingdom—he did not care how mean he was, how ragged, how little food he could procure. He knew one thing that if he should ask him if he would go to America and become a southern slave, he would knock him down, unless he should happen to be a non-resistant—(loud cheers). He knew he would say at once

> "Better to sit in freedom's hall,
> With a cold damp floor and a mouldering wall,
> Than to bend the neck and to bow the knee
> In the proudest palace of slavery"—(cheers).

That was the spirit of Englishmen. Now the slave gets a peck of corn a week, do not your poor get more than that, do they not get some little variety? A peck of Indian corn a week, two meals a day, the one taken about ten in the morning, the other after the toils of the day are over, when he is too happy to be released, and allowed to go back to his miserable hovel, where all must mingle promiscously on the cold floor with nothing to cover them. Here he endeavours to make his little hoe cake in the best way he can, and he has hardly caught a brief interval of sleep 'ere the cursed sound of the slave owner's lash, awakes him from his troubled dream, and he is again marched out to the rice field, to waste the few years which constitute the wretched remnant of his life in this ceaseless hopeless labor—(hear, hear). You have hardly begun to run the parallel; yet you can go no further. I ask if men are whipped here to drive them to their work, could you serve the humblest man in England so—(cheers). How many mutilated bodies bearing the mark of the lash or the brand of the iron can you produce? The British law would step in to protect the humblest individual, whilst the American slave received no protection whatever—(cheers). He would now give them a few specimens of the use of the whip extracted from southern newspapers—not the testimony of abolitionists, but the testimony of slave owners themselves, circulated all over the land. He then read the following extracts, "Committed to jail as a run away, a negro woman named Martha, 17 or 18 years of age, has *numerous scars of the whip* on her back." "Ten dollars reward for my woman Seby, *very much scarred about the neck and ears by whipping.*" "Stolen, a negro woman named Celia. On examining her back you will find *marks caused by the whip.*" "Was committed a negro boy named Tom, *is much marked with the whip.*" "Ran away, a negro fellow named Dick, has *many scars on his back* from being *whipped.*" "Committed to jail, a negro slave, his back is *very badly* scarred." "Committed, a mulatto fellow, his back *shows lasting impressions of the whip*, and leaves no doubt of his being a *slave.*" "Ran away, a negro man, named Johnson, *he has a great many marks of the whip* on his back." "Ran away, Bill, has *several large scars* on his back, from a *severe* whipping in *early* life." "Ran away, negro fellow John, from *being whipped has scars on his back, arms and thighs.*" "Left, my negro man George—has *marks of the whip very plain* on his thighs." "Brought to jail, a negro man named George—*he has a great many scars* from the lash." "Committed to jail, a negro boy named John, about 17 years old—his back *badly marked* with the whip, his upper lip and chin severely bruised." Now he (Mr. Garrison) would ask whether among the poor of England, there was anything like this—he was sure they would answer no.—(loud cheers.) They should now see how the religious public of America acted in this matter, the Reverend John—[illegible] could not catch the surname, a presbyterian preacher, frequently on a Lord's day morning, tied up his slaves lashed them, left them bound, and went away to preach, and on his return would finish their scourging. Mrs. Spence of Rockingham, used to boast that she was the best hand to whip a wench in all the county. She always whipped her slaves on a Sunday, and on being once asked the reason, she replied if I whipped them on any other day, I should lose a day's work, but by whipping on the Sunday their backs get well by Monday morning. He would now come to another remarkable feature of slavery; was it the fashion here, to put iron collars about the necks of their labourers, to mangle them and to see these victims carry their manacles about the country. There is no such thing as a chained labourer in England; now what is the practice in the United States. He would read some more extracts. "Ranaway a negro named David—with some *iron hobbles around each ancle.*" "Ranaway negress Caroline—had on a *collar with one prong turned down.*" Ranaway, a black woman, Betsey—had *an iron bar on her right leg.*" "Was committed to jail, a negro named Ambrose—has a *ring of iron* around his neck." "Ranaway, the negress Fanny—had on *an iron band about her neck.*" Ranaway a negro boy named James—said boy was *ironed* when he left me." This is another view of American slavery, and it is enough to fill the earth with shuddering.—(hear, hear and cheers.) Are you in the habit of putting burning irons into the flesh of the poor in this country; we do this in regard to our slaves: listen to the following. "Ranaway, a negro woman and two children; a few days before she went off, *I burnt her with a hot iron* on the left side of her face, *I tried to make the letter M.*" "One hundred dollars reward for a negro fellow, Pompey 40 years old, he is *branded* on the *left jaw*" "Was committed to jail, a negro man says his name is Josiah, his back very much scarred by the whip, and *branded on the thigh and hips in three or four places, thus, J M.*—the rim of his right ear has been bit or cut off." All this running to see if these poor fugitives can find protection, not under the star spangled banner of the United States, for wherever that waves there is no protection for the slave—but under Victoria in Canada, where thank God some 15,000 persons once slaves are now enjoying liberty and safety, having succeeded in escaping from their Southern Prison House.—(tremendous cheering.) There is another practice which these slave owners resort to, that, of mutilating their slaves. This is done for two reasons, first by way of punishment and to gratify the malevolence of their masters, and in the next place to make their detection more easy in case they should attempt to escape—hence it is a common practice to extract the teeth, to draw sound front teeth so that their slaves may be easily identified. The African race generally have remarkably good teeth, consequently it is not to be attributed to disease, but is a systematic portion of slavery. Advertisements like these are very common in the Southern newspapers, "committed to jail, Ned, about 25 years of age, has lost his *two upper front teeth.*" "Ten dollars reward for Mary, *one or two upper teeth out*, about 25 years old." "Ranaway a boy named Moses, *some of his front teeth out.*" "Ranaway *Sally, her front teeth out.*" "Ten dollars reward, Ranaway Julia a negress 18 or 20 years old. *She has lost her upper teeth* and the under ones *are all broken.*" Now (Mr. Garrison continued) conceive of the monstrous cruelty of thus extracting teeth at that age for the horrible purpose of identifying their slaves;—and yet this is done by people who dare to call themselves a christian people—who boast of their revivals of religion, who make many prayers, who talk loudly of their sanctuaries and their sanctuary privileges—multitudes of them are church members, very exact in regard to ceremonial observances, assure us that they are born of God, and yet are all this time thus treating their slaves—men, as much as they are, and stamped like them with the glorious image of the divinity.—(loud cheers.) He then remarked on another practice of slavery, that of hunting down fugitive slaves with blood hounds—he could read them many very painful and very horrible narratives of the sufferings endured by poor slaves under this head. Some had been actually torn to pieces by these ferocious animals, others so mangled as to be disabled for ever after. With regard to the slave trade, his countrymen boasted that they had washed their hands in innocence

of its horrors; in a great measure they had, but it was only to substitute a worse system, that of a domestic slave trade. Maryland, Virginia Kentucky and North Carolina were now slave breeding states, it was the most profitable method of employing capital, and since the acquisition of Texas, the value of slaves reared in Maryland and Virginia, had risen to the amount of from fifty to an hundred thousand dollars per year; in these States, slave children are "raised" for the market the same as cattle or pigs. Washington, the capital of this glorious republic, was the head quarters of this system—there, under the star-spangled banner, any man could qualify himself for dealing in human flesh and blood, by taking out a license which cost 400 dollars—(hear, hear). Now all this, he continued, appertains to the physical man—if slavery could only stop there, it would be, in some degree, tolerable; but it is the war which it makes on the image of God, on the intellect of man, on the immortal soul of man, the war against knowledge which makes it so utterly intolerable—where it extends, no slave may dare to read; the Gospel is withheld; and all which makes him a man is so far as possible blotted out—these are the hideous features of the system. It is because we deny, as abolitionists, that the religion which sanctions this system is a divine religion—because we tell the people that such a religion is not that of the church of Jesus Christ; but a synagogue of Satan, a cage of unclean birds—for this we are denounced as infidels—(cheers). We say that a religious man cannot be a man-stealer—the religion of the north and the religion of the south, for here they are one and indivisible, says, let him go and buy as many slaves as he can, and we will hold out to him the right hand of Christian fellowship. Now the abolitionists are infidels to all this, they dare to say that the minister of Jesus Christ never held a slave—never apologised for slavery—but like his Divine Lord is always on the side of the oppressed—(loud cheers). If this is infidelity I glory in it, and I stand here to say, that one of the severest and the longest struggles that the abolitionists have had, has been to vindicate the Bible as an anti-slavery book, against the American churches and the American colleges—for years have we been struggling to vindicate the Bible as an anti-slavery book, against the American churches and the American colleges—for years have we been struggling to vindicate the church of Christ against the foul aspersion that it is a church upholding slavery, and to prove that our Lord and Saviour is on the side of the oppressor—(cheers). We say that the religion which prevails in America, is nothing better than heathenism—a religion which forbids the Bible to be distributed under pains and penalties. Can we believe, that that can be a true religion? No. We must, therefore, declare to the world, that as for the religion of slave-owning America, it is a spurious religion, and it is time it was sent to its own place, the bottomless pit. Thank God he has not left himself without witnesses in that country; there are at least 7,000 men who have never bowed the knee to Baal, and they are increasing daily—(cheers). One object of my coming here is to see if the Christians of this country will not say that slavery is utterly unchristian, that slave owners can have no part in Christianity, whilst they remain such. Nothing keeps slavery alive, but its supposed Christian character—the moment that it is denounced as infidelity, it will die—but it comes to us in the name of Christianity, and, therefore, it is asked why they should be ashamed of it. That this was the view taken of it in America he proved by reading several documents—the first was an extract from a work by a southern slave owner, who says, "The most important view of the subject is the religious one—for assuredly, if slavery be adjudged as sin—if it be adjudged as sin—if it be condemned by the revealed will of God—then in Christendom it cannot exist. * * * I may assert with confidence that there is no fact in history or no proposition in ethics better established, than that slavery is recognised both in the old and new testament." He also quoted Dr. Fuller of South Carolina whose remarks were to the effect that if Slavery be a sin, then it was the immediate duty of the masters to abolish it whatever might be the result—but that slavery if they believed their bibles, was allowed in the patriarchial, and the prophetic ages, and is not condemned by the new testament—*If it be a sin* to hunt a fellow being with blood hounds, to use the branding iron and the lash as the instruments of robbing a human being of his rights—such was the language of America.—(cheers.) Slavery is sustained in America by all religious denominations—there may be exceptions, but these exceptions are few and far between, and do not affect the truth of the general assertion—and were it not for the apologies for slavery grounded on its being sanctioned by the bible, which are continually made by those who are the religious teachers of that nation—they should long since have seen it abolished. Therefore Christians of England, if you have any regard for pure christianity—if you desire to see the gospel of Jesus Christ prevail throughout the world—lift up your voices against that religion, which in the name of Christianity itself, enslaves your fellow beings and tramples on every holy tie. You ask what you can do—I know you are willing to aid us, and you can do so by multiplying your earnest remonstrances against slavery. Let me assure you there is not the slightest whisper which is uttered in this country against the wickedness of American slavery—but it is immediately conveyed to us there, by that great sounding board the press, which God has made to break on the slave holder with a voice of thunder.—(cheers.) You cannot undervalue these addresses. I rejoice to find myself here in Exeter, I remember a short time since when in the spirit of peace, you the women of Exeter sent over an address to your sisters the women of America, in the name of peace, and against the spirit of war.—(cheers.) I was present when in the midst of an immense assembly, in a room much larger than the present, that address was unfolded—it was received with thunders of applause; the peaceful sentiments it breathed penetrated the hearts of every one, and it had great effect in promoting the cause of peace in our land.—(loud cheers.) Women of Exeter; mothers, daughters, sisters, wives; there are mothers, daughters, sisters, wives, in slavery in our country, will you not help them—will you not sympathise with them—will you not lift up a voice in their behalf—will you not send out a word of writing to us who are labouring in their cause. I am sure you will do so; and I promise that it shall be seen by thousands in all parts of the free states, even if we cant say so for the slave states, but the slave owners themselves shall see it—(loud cheers). I have been promised a remonstrance on the part of the operatives of this country—thank God they are free to sign their names, or to make their marks—they will do so. I have been assured by two or three of the leading friends of the working classes, that they are prepared to do so. I was asked if one signed by two hundred or three hundred thousand of the working men of this country would do any good. Any good! I was thunderstruck. Yes, it will do good; send it to us, we will take it to that old Cradle of Liberty at Boston, to Faneuil Hall—there it shall be seen, read, and promulgated through the length and breadth of the land. He then referred to addresses from other classes suggesting that the Tories, if there were any, could help them. After all the worst that could be said of them, they were lovers of liberty and honest men. If they could get addresses from the religious denominations of all persuasions, it would be of the most important service; he referred to deputations from religious bodies, which had left this country for America who had done much harm to the anti slavery cause, by freely associating with the so called religionists of America, and thus keeping their iniquity in countenance. There was another view of the subject. What has England to do with the practice of slavery in this moral and religious republic. He would tell them the slave powers of America undertake to put England herself on the auction mart, and to dispose of her to the highest bidder. He knew they would not understand him when he told them that England is a bond slave in the southern plantations, and is liable to be bought or sold in her markets. By the laws of the slave states of America, a British subject venturing into a southern port for the purposes of trade is liable to be taken out of his vessel, shut up in the slave prison away from the protection of the British flag until the ship sails, when, if the expences of his maintenance in the jail are not paid, he is sold as a slave. If the English should venture to use an American seaman in that way, he was sure the old spirit of 1776 would again burst out. Faneuil Hall would be crowded, the people would begin to talk about Lexington, and Concord, and Bunker's Hill, and would never cease until they had put an end to such a restriction. After a few more remarks, Mr. Garrison sat down amidst great applause.

The Chairman presumed that Mr. Garrison, in the latter part of his speech, referred to coloured British subjects.

Mr. Garrison—Certainly. By the slave laws of America all free coloured persons, on their arrival in these states, are to be seized and thrust into prison, and there kept until the vessel which brings them shall take them away again. The American States were very tenacious of this claim, which they said was a matter of life and death to them—for, with the example of a free negro before their eyes, it would be impossible to keep their slaves from insurrection.

The following resolutions were then proposed, seconded, and carried unanimously. Able speeches were made, which we have not room for:—

Moved by Dr. Barham, seconded by Jno. Dymond, Esq., "That this meeting regards with amazement and horror the existence of a system of slavery in the United States, by which three millions of the population of that country are subjected to every

conceivable form of cruelty and degradation, bought and sold in the market, and held in the fetters of a helpless servitude."

Moved by Wm. Drew, Esq., seconded by R. W. Fox, Esq., "That the American people must either openly repudiate their declaration of independence—in which they affirm it to be "a *self-evident* truth, that all men are created *equal*, and endowed by their Creator with *an inalienable right to liberty*"—or stand justly accused before the world, and at the tribunal of Heaven, as guilty of unparalelled hypocrisy."

Moved by James Terrell, Esq., seconded by Rev. N. Hellings, "That this meeting, animated by an earnest desire for the welfare and prosperity of the United States, cordially proffers its sympathy and good wishes to the uncompromising abolitionists in that country, represented by Messrs. Garrison and Douglass on the present occasion, and trusts that they will continue to press onward until the last fetter shall be struck from the limb of the last slave on the American soil."

Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave, then rose, and was received with overwhelming enthusiasm. He said—he really thought on rising that he should feel great embarrassment, but the hearty manner in which he had been received had removed what little embarrassment had arisen when he looked on this extraordinary and crowded meeting. He would not allude to the resolutions, which embodied all that he could say on the subject—but would address a few words to them in reference to the great principle on which they should co-operate in removing slavery from the United States. When he first thought of the interference of British christians with slavery in America, he was somewhat fearful that that interference would do their cause an injury rather than a good. But his mind had undergone a change on this question, and he now believed that England possessed a power, superior to any power in the United States to operate against slavery—(cheers). Some sins, some evils in communities, could be best removed by the virtuous efforts of individuals composing these communities, but it was not so with slavery. That is such a monstrous system, such a giant crime, that it begets a character favourable to its own existence, vanquishing the moral perception, and blinding the moral vision of all who come in contact with it; and a nation has not the moral energy necessary to its removal. He therefore felt himself abundantly justified in calling in the aid of all christians—of all who were of good report in the British nation to testify against American slaverv. He felt he was not only at liberty, but justified in directing the attention of all the world, and fixing on it the indignant eye of condemnation from every portion of the globe. He felt that that general voice of indignation would be effectual—the slave owners were sensitive, and would writhe under it. Well had the poet Campbell said of their flag—

> Your banner bears two emblems,
> The one it freedom claims,
> The other that it bears
> Reminds you of your chains.
> Of white man's liberty the types
> Stand blazing in your stars;
> But what's the meaning of your stripes?
> They mean your negroes scars—(great cheering.)

Slave owners wither under these sharp rebukes, they feel that it is true, and they will be ashamed of that deed of deep damnation. It is then important that England should bear her testimony against this system—you have done much already, yet much more remains for you to do. They had whispered the truth—he was there to call on them to speak with a trumpet tongue, and in such a language that the slave owner in America could not misunderstand—(cheers). Let no distinction be made between the slave holder and his sin—let England taunt the slave owner with his sins, treat him as a sinner, regard him as a sinner, and their testimony could not fail—(cheers). A great deal had been said about deputations, his friend Garrison had hoped that no more would be sent from religious bodies in England, unless they sent better men—(cheers). Another gentleman (Mr. Hellings) had said something in extenuation of the deputation sent out some years since by the Baptist denomination. Now, said Mr. Douglass, I wish to say something about a deputation in order that you may learn from what they did in favour of the slave owner what you may do against slavery. In 1844, the Free Church of Scotland sent out a deputation, consisting of five ministers of that denomination, who were to represent their church in the United States. When the slaves of America heard of a *free* church, we had reason to believe that the day of our redemption drew near. Knowing nothing but slave churches before, we had reason to believe that a free church indeed had arisen in the midst of us, and that at least the deputation would have demanded emancipation for the long oppressed down trodden slave—(cheers)—but no such thing. They left us with the intention of going into the slave states, but before they left New York, they were earnestly remonstrated with against going into the slaves states of the Union at all—they were told that they would have to sacrifice their principles, and stain their cause with the contaminating touch of slavery. But they accepted the slave holders invitation, took their money; paralysed their own Christian feelings, turned a deaf ear to the groan of the slave as they went on their way through the South—were dumb on the question of slavery—were invited by the slave owners to their pulpits—dined at their tables, sat in their pews—heard them preach to their slave congregations—took the blood money which was offered them, and brought it to Scotland, to pay the free church ministers—(loud cheers), I charge them with having gone into a land of manstealers—among men whom they knew to be manstealers—they struck, for the sake of money, for the sake of filthy lucre, an alliance with these men—went into their country, saw millions of slaves driven to the field, treated like beasts—denied even the right to read the word of God, that being a crime severely punishable—and yet they never raised a whisper against it, because they received this blood money from the slave owners—(loud cheers). I say this much that it may be borne on the wings of the press to that Free Church of Scotland, and that they and the friends of the slave owner may know that the Christian people of England have a controversy with them on this question. Englishmen gave money to this Free Church, and the dissenters lavished their silver and gold on them—we want you to say certain words to them, which they will understand. Tell them to send back to America that blood stained money—(cheers). Dissenters of England say to this Free Church of Scotland, that your money and the blood stained money they received from the slave owners of America shall not clink in the same coffers together—(immense cheering). Say to them, send it back, for by sending it back, a great work will be done on behalf of the slaves' cause in the United States. The Free Church has the power of doing a noble work, and of giving slavery a blow that shall send it reeling to its grave, as if struck by the bolt of heaven—(great cheering). They have the power to raise such a question in the southern states as never was raised before. Let them send it back also, because it does not belong to them—the Free Church of Scotland has now stolen money in her treasury, and the English Christian knows it. I say then to the dissenters who shake hands with these slave owners—whether in the Evangelical Alliance or out of it—that they are shaking hands with men who are wielding the bloody lash over three millions of men, passing from time into eternity. Sir, I want to speak to you of the religious condition of the slaves in the United States—three millions of people under the drippings of the American sanctuary, are denied the right of marriage—think of it—imagine what must be the state of society there—and yet this is in a land of Bibles, in a land of churches, in a land of missionaries—you will not believe it. It is creditable to your humanity that you are unwilling to do so—yet it is, nevertheless true. That is the practice of the American Church, and I mean by the American Church, the combination of all those bodies, ranging under the names of Methodist, or Baptist, or Presbyterian, or Unitarian, or Episcopalian, and numberless others whose names would take up half the evening to enumerate. These I regard as the Church of America, and under the sanction of this church this state of things exists. Sanctified man stealers are members of these churches; women are sold to pay for the communion service in these churches; men are sold into slavery to pay for the churches themselves, or to send the Gospel to the Heathen. The slave prison and the church, stand next door to each other, and the groans and cries of the poor slaves are drowned in the hymn of praise of the slave's religious master. The blood-stained gold, the price of the slave goes to support the pulpit, and the pulpit in return covers this infernal business with the garb of christianity—(immense applause). The man who claimed to hold these hands, and to own me as his property *(Thomas Halls)*, he is a Methodist, a class leader in that church; yet I have seen that wretch tie up by the two hands a young woman only eighteen years old, strip her and keep her half suspended, and standing on the ends of her toes for five hours at a time, and lash her with the bloody cowskin, until the warm blood dripped in a pool at her feet; and repeating at the time this passage of Scripture, "He that knoweth his master's will and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." It would be out of place to speak much of myself—(loud cries of no, no). I have known what slavery is by experience. I

have felt the slave driver's lash, and I carry those marks on my back, and they will accompany me to the grave. I was a Methodist, it was not until I was satisfied that that church was upheld by and guilty in every way of upholding slavery, that I became willing to say a word against it. My case is the case of thousands associated with my friend Garrison, who have rendered themselves obnoxious because they opposed churches which recognised slavery. We have been constrained to arrive at the position that the American churches and clergy are unworthy of christian regard and the christian support of this country, or any other country, and that they ought to be abolished. I believe that slavery finds its strongest support in the church, and the church for this charges us with infidelity. Like Garrison, I care not for these charges coming from that source; because I believe in a religion based on the broad foundation of love to God and love to man. I believe in a religion which makes it the duty of its votaries to visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and to keep yourselves unspotted from the world—(cheers). I believe in a religion which makes it our duty to regard the liberties of our neighbours—(cheees)—and because I do believe in this religion, I hate that man stealing, woman whipping religion which is professed in the United States—(cheers). I come now to what I wish the people to do. I want you to deny christian fellowship to this slave holding church. I demand I claim it as the duty of Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and all denominations in this country, to have no fellowship with the American churches, hence, and for ever to separate from them, until they shall have washed their hands from this guilt; unless you do that, you must become in part responsible for slavery in the United States—for while we give to the slave owner the Christian name, and throw around him the garment of Christianity, and endorse his character as a good Christian, so long will he glory in his shame, and drive his slaves to the field unrebuked and undisturbed—(cheers). You must, therefore, bear your unmitigated testimony to the American people against this iniquity, by dissolving all partnership, and disavowing all religious connection with them. Why does slavery exist in those States? Because it is respectable; that it is so considered, is evident from the fact th[illegible]rs of religion are slave owners; that the President of the United States is a slave owner, that the diplomatic body, who represent that country in every foreign State, are slave owners. Slave owners are found in the Congress and in the Senate, in every department of the American government, and in every place south of Mason and Dickson's line—(hear, hear). We wish to make it disreputable; it is not so because of that character of Christian which it has invested itself—we come to this country therefore to raise the curtain on its iniquity, and to show the dreadful deeds done in the name, and under the sanction of Christian churches, and to ask you to lift your testimony against such churches—and to s[illegible]r Christian relations with them. Remember here are 3,000,000 [illegible] people without Bibles—whilst you are sending your Missionaries and your Bibles to the remotest ends of the earth, and are straining all your energies to carry Christianity to the heathen. While at this very moment, you have an Evangelical Alliance now sitting with the avowed purpose of making war against the anti-Christian character of the Church of Rome—because that church, they say, is acting in opposition to the doctrines of Christianity, by discountenancing the reading of the Scriptures among its laity—here is slavery depriving three millions of their Bibles—denying them the right to read the word of the God who made them—to teach them to do so is an offence punishable, if committed a second time, with death in Christian America—(great sensation).

Some slight interruption took place, in consequence of a gentleman wishing to address the meeting; he had attempted to before Mr. Douglass began, but the meeting being impatient to hear Mr. Douglass, the chairman decided against him.

Mr. Douglass then resumed, and made some further observations on the religious character which the advocates of slavery give it in America. Not only do they quote Scripture in palliation of it, but justify it as an institution of divine appointment—not only to be permitted, but enforced as being sanctified by the express command of God, and universally obtaining, under the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensations. He then remarked on the character of the sermons preached by these friends of humanity to their slave congregations; the topic generally insisted on was the necessity of obedience of their slaves to their masters. He said he would give them a specimen of the sort of sermons which it had been many times his fate to listen to. He then buttoned up his coat, twisted his countenance into a grave and canting aspect, and with a most inimitable tone of voice, and a genuine Yankee twang, gave the following sermon amidst shouts of laughter: His text was "Servants obey your Masters." "You should obey your masters, said the preacher, in the first place, because the Lord has commanded you to be obedient. This reason alone will be sufficient to induce obedience on that part of my audience who believe it to be their duty to obey the Lord in all things. But it may be asked by some of you, why are we to obey the Lord? I say obey him, because he is all wisdom, and knows what is best for you to do—because he commands it, therefore, never stop to ask whether it is right or wrong, but be obedient to your masters. You should obey your masters in the second place, because your happiness is dependent on your obedience. Ah servants! this is an important consideration, one to which you will do well to attend to. Wherever you see wretchedness, want, misery, poverty, or distress, oh! remember it is in consequence of disobedience. Oh! is this the case with you. In order to elucidate my meaning, allow me to state a fact. Sambo, there, was sent by his master some time ago to perform a certain amount of labour, which, had he obeyed his master's orders, would have taken him two hours and a half. His master was a pious man, and after waiting for the expiration of that time, he went into the field where Sambo should have been at work, and lo and behold, there lay Sambo's hoe in one place, and Sambo fast asleep in another. Oh! servants, think of this pious master—his commands disobeyed, his work not done—his authority thrown off. Oh! I say, think of the trying position in which this kind master was placed. To the Law and to the testimony he went to know his duty in the premises—there he read. "He who knoweth his master's will and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." He therefore took Sambo up and lashed him, so that he was unabled to work for a few weeks. Now then servants I want you to bear in mind this, that Sambo's whipping was caused solely by his disobedience. Oh! then let me exhort you, if you wish to be well fed, well cared for, to bask in the sunshine of your masters' favour—let me exhort you to be very obedient to your masters. You should obey your masters in the the third place, because of the sense of gratitude with which you should be inspired, by the knowledge of the fact that the Lord in his mercy, brought you from Africa to this christian country. Oh servants! you cannot too highly estimate the kindness of the Almighty in bringing you to this country. Africa bleeding Africa—dark benighted Africa; no gospel there—no sanctuary privileges there—but universal darkness and despair every where prevails, The Lord saw you in that condition, bowing down to stocks and stones, and worshipping Images the work of men's hands. Seeing you in this wretched state, he put it into the hearts of good men, such as the excellent and zealous Bishop Newton, to leave their homes and their families, and dare the fury of the waves, to snatch you as a brand from the burning and bring you to this christian country. Think how many slaves are now in the kingdom of heaven, which never would have entered that kingdom if they had not been brought to this christian country. Such sir, said Mr. Douglass, is the miserable twaddle—the humbug palmed off on the poor slave as the blessed gospel of Jesus Christ. Sir they go further still; they say to the negro "You should obey your masters, because of the dependant condition in which you find yourself placed. Behold your hard hands and your strong frames, your masters and mistresses have soft hands and delicate constitutions, and white skins; whence this difference; "it is the Lord's doings and marvellous in our eyes." But, Oh servants, while you have strong hands and strong frames remember that the relations resulting from it are reciprocal—for while you have strong frames and robust constitutions, you have not the gift of intellect—you could not think for yourselves—you could not provide for yourselves—so the Lord in his infinite goodness has given you kind masters to think for you—(laughter). Oh the wisdom of God!" I know, he continued, this will strike the audience as being the merest caricature, you have never heard of anything of the kind out of the slave states—but had I time I could read you sermons and resolutions of religious bodies, declaring sentiments identical with this—think then of three millions of people subjected to such teaching as this within 14 days of your own island. I demand of you then if you are friends of the Missionary enterprise, that you should demand the admission of your missionaries amongst these slaves—that your missionaries should go into the midst of them. Tell these slave-owners, that you will not be recreant to the duty of him who has told you to go forth to all the world, and to preach the Gospel to every creature—(cheers). If you sit silently by, and see Christianity robbed of its glory, the Bible denied to the people, and never make an effort to extend the Gospel—and give the Bible to the people—I tell you, you will be recreant to the cause of truth, recreant to the cause of God, and

recreant to the cause of humanity—(great cheering). My friend Mr. Garrison, and I call him my friend in no platform sense of the term: I feel him to be my friend—the friend of the friendless—the friend of the slave—the friend of the negro in the United States—I could not but feel the strongest emotions of delight, when I saw the responsive feelings which his eloquence called forth from time to time in this great audience on behalf of my race—(cheers) I too thank you all on behalf of my brethren in bondage, for the patient hearing you have given me. I shall go back to that land, although I go back in the face of danger—for there is not one spot of ground in all that United States, in which I can stand free, whether in the North, South, East, or West; over-shadowing me is the terrible probability of being sent back to that slavery from which I have fled. But whatever dangers may await me, however dreadful may be my fate in that country; though the blood hounds may be upon my track, I shall go back with the proud satisfaction, that although I may be made a slave of—although I may be struck down—although I may be killed to satisfy the fierce vengeance aroused against me on account of my running away, and of my exposure of their iniquity in this country. I shall carry with me the proud satisfaction of having enjoyed at least one year of freedom in this glorious country—(tremenduous cheering). Of that year of freedom I cannot be deprived, and it is almost enough of happiness for one who has been twenty-one years of his life in the bondage of slavery to enjoy such a year of freedom—(cheers). I tell you that it is a good thing to be in England, I like it, I feel that the representation made by the great Curran is not an extravagancy when he says that British law makes all men free as soon as their foot is set on British earth—no matter what language they speak, or on what dark spot they happened to be born. I feel it to be true. I will go to the land of my birth, I will proclaim it in the ears of the American people, whether I'm in a state of slavery or freedom, while I have a voice to speak it shall be raised in exposing the guilt of the slave-owners, and in contrasting the munificent freedom of monarchical England, with the slave-holding, man-stealing, woman-whipping, degradation of democratic republican America—(loud cheers). I have this glorious scene here, it is Daguerrotyped in my heart, I shall go forth in the land of my birth, and tell them of the thousands and tens of thousands who have heard with indignation of their oppression—of the brave men and the feeling women who have listened with shame to the story of their woes. Oh! Mr. President, I wish all the slaves of America could peep in, could see us just as we are, and know as I know, the sympathies of this audience for their down-trodden spirits—(vehement cheering). Mr. Douglass having reiterated his thanks, sat down amidst the loudest plaudits.

Mr. Wilkinson then moved the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Latimer, and carried unanimously:—"That an Auxiliary to the Anti-slavery League, lately established in London, be formed in this city, and that the following be appointed members of the committee, with power to add to their number—J. C. Sercombe, William Drewe, Rev. Francis Bishop, T. Latimer, R. W. Fox, Dr. Barham, R. T. Abraham, Edward Henning, James Terrell, Rev. John Bigwood, Rev. N. Hellings, and J. P. Nichols."

Mr. Garrison then took a solemn farewell of the audience. As he was about to set out for Scotland and Ireland, prior to his return to his own country, it was most probable that they would meet face to face no more.

Mr. Bishop announced that Mr. Douglass would again address an audience the next evening, an intimation which was received with cheers.

The thanks of the meeting were then voted to the Chairman by acclamation, and at eleven o'clock the meeting separated.

THE MEETING ON SATURDAY EVENING.

On Saturday evening, the Subscription Rooms was again crowded to excess, to hear Mr Douglass, so intense was the interest excited by the proceedings of the previous evening. The Rev. F. Bishop proposed, that Edmund Hennings, Esq., father-in-law of the late Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, the friend and associate of Wilberforce should take the chair.

The Chairman opened the proceedings by reading a letter from Lord John Russell to Sir T. Buxton, dated many years back, strongly denouncing any encouragement to slavery. He contrasted this with Lord John Russell's conduct in bringing in the Sugar Bill which he hoped every one in the room would oppose.

Mr. Douglass said, that as he understood there was some fear of misapprehension as to the Wesleyan sermon he had endeavoured to represent to them last night, he should this evening draw their attention chiefly to the religious aspect of slavery in America, in order to satisfy them that the picture had not been overdrawn, and that he was only desirous of showing them the difference between a false and a true profession. In the course of his remarks he read a variety of advertisements, all including an acknowledgment or avowal of the connexion between slavery and the different religious bodies in the United States. In one the public were informed that a gang of ten negroes highly recommended would be sold, said negroes being the property of the Independent Church! On another occasion, the will of a highly evangelical lady had been proved, by which she bequeathed one-fourth of her live stock to "The Missionary Society, for the publishing of the Gospel among the heathens." The most conclusive document of the evening, was an extract of a "*Sermon* to be preached to slaves," published by one Bishop Meade, of Virginia, (as we understood of the Episcopal Church), to which he had boldly taken the text "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." "This," expounded the Bishop, "ought to be—Do to others as you *would* wish they should do to you, if you were in their situation, and they were in yours. Now, servants, you see if you were in your master's position and they were your slaves, wouldn't you wish them to be obedient and careful, and do all they could to improve and take care of your property? Of course you would. It's quite natural. So you see you ought to do the same for them." [The argument, said Mr. Douglass, amounts to this—that if any ruffian should present a pistol at the chairman's head and demand his money, it would be his duty to give it up; because, of course, if he were the assailant, and the robber in his position, he would wish the purse to be given up to him.] He then read the following extract from the sermon, to prove that the sermon he had given the night before was no caricature—"Almighty God hath been pleased to make you slaves here, and to give you nothing but labour and poverty in this world, which you are obliged to submit to, as it is His will that it should be so. * * * Take care that you do not fret or murmur, grumble or repine, at your condition, for this will not only make your life uneasy, but will greatly offend Almighty God. * * * Now when *correction* is given you, you either deserve it, or you do not deserve it. But whether you really deserve it or not, it is your [illegible] and Almighty [illegible] requires that you bear it patiently. You may, perhaps, think that this is hard doctrine, but if you consider it right you must needs think otherwise of it. Suppose, then, that you deserve correction, you cannot but say that it is just and right you should meet with it. Suppose you do not, or at least you do not deserve so much or so severe a correction for the fault you have committed, you perhaps have escaped a great many more, and are at last paid for all. Or, suppose that you are quite innocent of the crime laid to your charge, and suffer wrongfully in that particular thing, is it not possible you may have done some other bad thing which was never discovered, and that Almighty God, who saw you doing it, would not let you escape without punishment one time or another? And ought you not in such case to give glory to Him, and be thankful that He would rather punish you in this life for your wickedness than destroy your souls for it in the next life? But suppose that even this was not the case (a case hardly to be imagined), and that you have by no means, known or unknown, deserved the correction you suffered, there is this great comfort in it, that if you bear it patiently, and leave your cause in the hands of God, He will reward you for it in Heaven, and the punishment you suffer unjustly here, shall turn to your exceeding great glory hereafter." The reading of the above excited marked expressions of disgust. Mr. Douglass then took a rapid review of all the religious bodies in the United States, with relation to their connection with slavery. He read a resolution passed by the Wesleyan Methodist Society, stating that "they considered slavery a divine institution, and had neither right, *desire* or *intention* to interfere with, the relation between masters and there slaves. All the other religious bodies had slave holders among them, both of their clergy and laity, with the exception of the Quakers, whom every black man looked on as his friend. Still tho they had no slave holders among them, they gave a negative support to slavery by closing their doors to all discussion on the subject, which had caused the secession from the body of a few brave men who wished to pass resolutions denunciatory of slavery. What he wished was to see the religious bodies in this country, refuse all communion with them until they had wiped out the stain. If this were done he believed slavery would not live five years longer. Mr. Douglass concluded by an eloquent and gallant appeal to the ladies, on behalf of the bazaar to be held in Philadelphia, for the benefit of the cause. It was desirable that contributions should be forwarded by the end of September.

The Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP moved a resolution expressive of the thanks of the meeting to Mr. Douglass, and pledging themselves to do all that they rightfully could to undo the heavy burdens of the three millions of slaves whose cause he so ably advocated. Mr. NICHOLLS seconded the resolution.

R. W. FOX, Esq., then proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by G. W. TURNER, Esq., who assured the lecturer that in whatever clime he might have been born, while he laboured in the cause of humanity, he had more respect for him than the highest potentates of the earth. Let him go on in his course, and he would perform a higher part on the theatre of life, than it was the lot of many to possess and enjoy.

To the Editor of the Western Times.

Sir,—As I shall have left this neighbourhood before your next publication will you kindly give insertion to the following explanation relative to the Anti-Slavery Meeting held in Exeter yesterday evening, as I am anxious to prevent any misconception of my views and motives, if such have arisen.

My attendance at the meeting was purely accidental, and certainly I had no intention of taking any part in the proceedings, much less of interrupting them. I heard the greater part of Mr. Garrison's speech, the tone of which struck me as not being the best calculated to promote the sacred and important objects of the meeting. A resolution having been moved and seconded; it was stated by some one that any observation relative thereto, should be made previous to its being put to the meeting, which induced me to request permission to make a few remarks thereon.

I was not unmindful of the impatience naturally felt to hear Mr. Douglas, and I resolved for my own sake as well as that of the meeting not to occupy a moment longer than I could avoid, and nothing but my sincere desire to promote the *permanent* objects of the meeting, could have induced me to trespass upon its attention. Having, I hope satisfactorily explained what might otherwise be misconstructed, I congratulate myself that my views upon the subject were in a great measure participated in by yourself, as was evinced by the excellent remarks made by you, at a subsequent period of the meeting.

Permit me to observe, that I entertain as strong feelings of hatred and abhorence at the inhuman and unchristian practice of slavery as any individual at that meeting, and that I have been long convinced, that it will be found in the long run dangerous and unprofitable. I believe that God has not left himself without witness in this important matter, but that he can and will vindicate his laws and his justice, by showing that they were conceived and designed to promote the temporal and eternal welfare of his creatures.

I take it, that slavery is an attempt to gain by unjust and indirect means certain *ulterior* advantages from the physical powers of the slave. Now, it is a mere truism, that the greatest return from human labour can never be obtained, except where a perfect harmony exists between the physical and mental powers of man; a state totally incompatible with slavery. I know, from experience, that one free and intelligent labourer under a system of piece-work, with the full conviction of reaping the reward of his labours, will prove more profitable. than three men sent from the dispiriting habitation of a union workhouse, to fill up the tedious time by listless and despairing toil, without any impetus to exertion or hope of reward.

My chief regret arose from the assertion of some rev. gentleman, who assumed that I desired to interrupt the proceedings, and contended that being a *stranger*, I had no right to address the meeting. I do think it would be a great source of satisfaction to the *American* slave-owners, could they know that at such a meeting called for the *express purpose* of denouncing *their* conduct, a person favourable to the objects of such a meeting was prevented giving expression to his opinions, on the ground of *being a stranger*, thereby giving a sanction to the objection raised by the Americans, that the British people have no right to interfere with their internal arrangement and domestic economy.

There is something peculiar in the state of America, which being a young and partly undeveloped country, has grown up under a system of slavery: and doubtless, there are many genuine lovers of liberty in that country, sincerely anxious to wipe out the stain that slavery has impressed upon her national character. My confidence is in the increasing spread of knowledge, and that as all vice is folly, so it will in the end be found that free-labour is not only more productive, but cheaper also, and much more conducive than slavery to promote the permanent welfare and security of all nations.

I cannot take my leave without acknowledging the courteous and hospitable kindness I have received during this first short visit to Devonshire, the beautiful scenery and auspicious climate have impressed me with a sense of delight which will not be easily effaced, and which even this trifling incident is not sufficient to mar. Relying upon your love of truth and well known integrity, to give insertion to this letter, I remain dear sir, with great respect, faithfully yours. C. H. LATTIMORE.

Park Crediton, Aug. 29th, 1846.

CHRISTIAN SLAVERY!

The meetings held at the Subscription Rooms last week, and the disclosures there made by Mr. Garrison and his sable coloured colleague, Mr. Frederick Douglass, have excited considerable interest, and awakened the sympathies of all who attended, on the behalf of the slave population of America. The startling announcement of 3,000,000 of human beings in the United States, subject to the accursed and accumulated horrors of slavery, and a large proportion of them in the possession of professing Christians, is a subject to be deplored, and is humiliating and degrading to the feelings of humanity. Every denominational section of the church appears, by Mr. Douglass' statement, to be guilty of the enormity of which he complained; his charges were levelled indiscriminately against *bishops, priests, deacons, and flock*—all classes have, and are engaged in trafficking in human flesh and blood, with brutalizing cruelty. He however fearlessly took off the masks from their hypocritical countenances, and displayed them with stains of blood upon their brow, rendered ridiculous, as well as disgusting, by their being blended with pale-faced meekness, and the professed smile of Christian love; standing forth with bold effrontery, endeavouring to establish their wretched practices upon the rock of scripture truth, and to prove them not contrary to its precepts, and its injunctions. Never was such blind infatuation as this! Never was scripture more grossly perverted! And yet, strange to say, these are the men who profess they have the very key of knowledge, in reference to every experimental doctrine of our holy religion—they who talk of the convincing, enlightening, comforting, assisting, and instructing influences of the Holy Spirit; and yet upon this horrible traffic in human blood and man stealing, which is classed by St. Paul with the murderers, and adulterers, and every and all the most abominable vices which can be enumerated, they profess not to be able to discover that it is contrary to "sound doctrine." "Prove that it is sinful, and contrary to the religion of Christ," say they, with apparent sanctimonious sincerity, "and the system must and will be abolished;" as though there was no spark of selfishness in their hearts, but only a pure desire to act in accordance with their profession. Such a declaration as this, in the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, must emanate from the most desperate and hardened hypocrisy, or the God of this world must have blinded the eyes of their understanding to a degree of darkness unparallelled; and what is still worse, all the boasted advancement of scripture knowledge in our own land is but a "bag of moonshine," provided our Divines cannot prove that the practice of man stealing, and slave-dealing is sinful. But they can do so if they chose, and they certainly ought, in the most demonstrative, clear, and positive manner, show the fallacy of their specious dogmas, and thus put the American slave-dealing christians to the test, whether they are willing to discontinue their nefarious traffic upon being convicted by fair arguments, or whether they will act without hypocrisy, throw off the borrowed cloak of religion, and appear in their true characters, as lovers only of the mammon of unrighteousness. Hence we see the propriety and necessity of adopting the course suggested by Mr. Garrison, and Mr. Douglass, of the christians of England making a decisive and prominent movement in strengthening the efforts of the Anti-slavery league, by their united co-operation in a christian spirit, and thereby assist them to prosecute the great and noble work they have undertaken, until success shall crown their efforts, and right shall overcome might, and the oppressed shall go free.

If, on the other hand, the various denominations of christians, or any of them, shall in consequence of feeling themselves aggrieved (I speak advisedly,) by the serious charges brought against them by the Anti-slavery advocates, of never rebuking their slave holding brethren—never remonstrating with them on their soul-destroy- and demoralizing traffic; but tacitly by their silence sanctioning its continuance, until the Anti-slavery League began to kindle a blaze of enquiry and condemnation, that was likely to consume the silent abettors, with the actual perpetrators of this heinous sin, into non-entities of christian principle.—If, in consequence of this, they consider themselves justified in standing on neutral ground, and therefore will not unite in christian effort with the League in those justifiable and scriptural measures which they have suggested; then will it appear, whatever may be their profession, that they are des-

titute of that philanthropic principle which should be the chief characteristic of human nature, when influenced by the all-absorbing spirit of true christianity. It is vain for them to assert that we have nothing to do with the workings of the internal system of the American policy, that we ought not to interfere with their social and political measures—they might, with just as much propriety, assert that we have no right to interest ourselves concerning heathenism and idolatry. American christian slavery is far the most deplorable and despicable—the former is the result of ignorance, the latter of detestable selfishness cloaked by hypocrisy. Besides, most of the religious denominations in America are directly or indirectly associated with the various denominations in our own country, consequently, we have greater means of access, and a better prospect of success; therefore, if we do not, as christians, exert ourselves to the utmost in discountenancing and denouncing the abominable traffic, and thereby endeavour to induce the Americans to remove the foul stain from their christian character, we shall, and must remain, under the suspicion, at least, of being "partakers of their evil deeds."

A WESLEYAN.

Exeter, 31st August, 1846.

Mount Radford, Exeter, Sept. 2nd, 1846.

Sir,—The *Anti-Slavery* meetings held at the Royal Subscription Rooms on the evenings of Friday and Saturday last, have been the subject of much judicious talk and interested sympathy. God forbid that I should refrain from joining in those christian feelings—I trust I shall yet live to see that happy day when the slaves of every hue and every clime shall stand forth in all the enjoyment of perfect freedom. Having been an eye witness of the extent to which this unnatural system is carried on in America, I do rejoice to hear that the matter is being so ably represented throughout our highly favoured land as it is. I trust the Exonians will one and all pledge themselves to do what they can in order to its total and universal extinction at the earliest period possible.

But one circumstance I deeply regret: I refer to the very painful position in which the dissenters of England (especially the Wesleyans) were placed by the uncourteous, unqualified, expressions, made use of by *Frederick Douglas*, the fugitive slave of America, whilst addressing the meeting, expressions which were fully calculated to convey the idea that the Wesleyans of England especially (both ministers and people) were opposed to the principles of Anti-Slavery—sanctioned and supported slavery by continuing to hold out the hand of fellowship with those of the American methodists—both evenings contending that that particular section of Christ's Church were more culpable than any other sect, nor would he hear anything in extenuation. Now, sir, I consider this to be at once both unwise and unjustifiable. Facts, numberless facts can be adduced to show that it is far different than to what Frederick Douglas asserts. The zeal at all times manifested by the Wesleyans in the total abolition of slavery; the rejection of individuals in society who are in any way connected with this odious traffic; and the reports of the annual Conferences of the ministers of that body—must fully convince every reflecting mind that the statements of Frederick are altogether unchristianlike and untrue. I have been informed that at the last annual Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Ministers held at Bristol, it was asked—Whether the Conference could adopt any further measure for the entire abolition of Slavery? The Conference, deeply convinced that Negro Slavery is one of the foulest of our national sins, and ought on grounds strictly religious to be strenuously opposed to all who fear God—the Conference earnestly recommends our members and friends who now are and hereafter shall be, to use their best exertions to promote the early and entire abolition of the brutal and inhumanising principles of Slavery.

Surely after this I need say no more, but I do much regret that *Federick Douglas* should so bemean himself as to venture upon such grounds without any qualifications.

JUSTIA.

B. Mercury. Sept. 5. 1846

American Slavery.

Another public meeting, in reference to the state of slavery at present existing in the United States of America, was held in the Large Room, Broadmead, on Wednesday evening, for the purpose of hearing from Frederick Douglass, the fugitive slave, from Maryland, an exposition of the support afforded to slaveholders by the conduct of the American churches; and also for the purpose of admitting of some explanations in reference to statements made by that person, and by Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, at a previous evening's meeting. The room was densely crowded in every part.

George Thomas, Esq., in taking the chair, explained the circumstances under which the meeting had been called. During the speech of their friend Douglass, at the former meeting, a something was said in respect to the conduct of the American churches, which, by a few in the room, was not deemed satisfactory, and this meeting was called to give those few an opportunity—should any explanation which might be made not be considered satisfactory to them—to state publicly the points upon which they differed. If he understood the matter arightly, it was thus: their friends from America were anxious to inform the churches in this country of the condition of the churches in America in relation to the great question of slavery, and they asked them not to join in religious fellowship with those who participated in, or justified, the holding of slaves (hear). The ground of difference was, that the churches here had been receiving ministers who stated themselves not to be slaveholders, or the supporters of slavery; while the friends from America were not satisfied that they should take their simple statement that they were against slavery, that being considered by them not a sufficient test. He must say for himself, that if a minister of the gospel were to declare to him unequivocally that he was opposed to slavery, he should be satisfied; but if afterwards it could be shown that he not only was in fellowship with those who held slaves, but held slaves himself, that would be a different matter (hear). Such charges were made against the churches in America, and therefore the Christians in England should be very careful in receiving American ministers here that they might not seem to go in favour of slavery. He believed their American friends, Douglass and Garrison, did not ask them to go beyond this—that they should take especial care not to receive into communion with them any upholders of slavery. In the United States ministers from the southern slave churches were received in the northern churches as ministers, and that was viewed by the abolitionists as a dereliction of duty on the part of the northern churches. He regretted that Mr. Garrison was not now present, for he (Mr. Thomas) could not discharge his duty without noticing a something said by him at the last meeting—namely, that he hoped they would send no more deputations to America. Mr. Garrison named Dr. Cox and the last Quaker deputation, and it therefore became necessary that he (the chairman) should say a few words as to what was the last Quaker deputation. It was sent out last year, not for the purpose of advocating the abolition principle, but of reconciling a schism which certainly had taken place in the Society of Friends there upon the subject of slavery. A large body had separated from the rest because they considered that sufficient energy had not been shown in endeavouring to carry out the main point; it was understood that there was no difference of religious principles, and the deputation was sent out to reconcile the conflicting bodies. He could readily show that the four members of that deputation were friends of the anti-slavery cause, and three of them were members of the Anti-Slavery Society of London. As they were going over in the *Great Western*, they entered into a controversy with a slaveholder, which ended in their being told by him that if they came with such sentiments into the slave states they would have 24 hours' notice to leave the country, and if they did not do so they would be hung up. This showed that they advocated sound principles: besides, three of them had since signed the declaration against the admission to this country of slave-grown sugar. After some further remarks on this head, the Chairman proceeded to read a letter from the Rev. J. Howell, who had been present at the last meeting, but who was prevented from attending the present. He stated that he had been a missionary in Jamaica, and entered into details to show that any deficiency of labour arose not from the indisposition of the free blacks to work for a moderately fair remuneration, but from an effort of the planters to cut them down to starvation wages. During the time of apprenticeship 1s. 6d. per day was fixed as the value of a negro's work—the planters reduced them to 1s., to which they submitted, and now they wanted to give them only 9d., to which they could not consent. The Chairman then explained the course which he proposed the meeting should take:—There were certain resolutions which would be moved and seconded, he hoped as briefly as possible, which should be first got rid of. As to the fellowship of the churches, all that was intended by their American friends was, that Christians in this country should raise up a standard, and keep to it, and that having emancipated their own slaves, they should say to the American churches—"We

cannot have religious fellowship with you unless you wipe out the foul blot of slavery—unless you who profess to be the freest country in the world wash your hands of this iniquity" (hear). If that explanation was not deemed satisfactory they would, after the resolutions, hear any gentleman who might wish to address them, and should there be a discussion, he hoped that it would be carried on with calmness, and with a determination to give to every one a fair hearing, so as to be better able to come to a sound judgment at last (applause).

Josiah Hunt, Esq., in moving the first resolution, said he did so with feelings of the greatest goodwill for the American people, and with deep sympathy for his coloured brethren who were held in the galling chains of slavery. The remonstrances of the British people, offered in Christian love, would, he hoped, be wafted across the Atlantic, and be received in a kindred spirit. He hoped they would receive the blessings from on high, and that some of those present might yet live to hail the day when their American brethren, of every colour and every class, would be in the full enjoyment of their inestimable and inalienable right—liberty.

Joseph Reynolds, Esq., seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted.

The Rev. T. E. Thoresby, in moving the second resolution, said, so long as slavery was upheld by the professing church of Christ in America, so long, he believed, would it have something like a secure standing, but no longer (cheers). If the whole professing church of Christ were once to cast the foul thing from them, and denounce it as they would denounce other sins, slavery would be no more. Correct policy, then, required them to deal with the American churches on the subject; and then came the question—how should they deal with them? They had sent out remonstrance upon remonstrance, and yet the American churches adhered to slavery with a marvellous tenacity (hear). He thought they should now follow up their expostulations, and refuse to hold Christian communion with those churches (hear). He would not undertake to decide how far they were Christians—he would leave that to their consciences and to God—but slavery destroyed that which was intended to be gained by Christian communion (hear). When Christians united together in fellowship, their first object was to circulate the word of God; but they found that three millions of people were, by slave laws, forbidden to have that word (hear). Other objects of Christian communion were—purity of life, the promotion of justice, the establishment of kindly feeling, and other things which slavery assailed. The Christian churches in England were, therefore, justified in refusing communion with the churches which upheld slavery in America (cheers). He, and the church he belonged to, were prepared to do that, either in union with others or otherwise (renewed cheers). When any minister from America presented himself he would put this question to him, through the chairman, "Are you a slaveholder, or do you uphold slavery?" If he said he was, he would then move that he be not heard; and should it be resolved to hear him, he would not be found among those who would sit to listen to him (hear, and cheers). Having said thus much, he felt called upon, in justice, to refer to a remark of Mr. Garrison at the last meeting, whom he regretted was not now present. "Send us," said Mr. Garrison, "no more deputations." Somebody called out "Thompson;" upon which he said, "Thompson! Send us no more divines—Thompson was human"—thereby implying that the deputations of ministers had not done their duty (hear, hear). Such, too, he believed was the impression on Mr. Douglass's mind. Some years ago Mr. Garrison made a similar statement at Glasgow, where he asserted that the English ministers who had been to America had been the greatest traitors to abolition. At the meeting of the Congregational Union, in Brunswick chapel, Bristol, in 1840, Dr. Mattheson, one of the deputation to America, referred to this charge and said, "In several of the states, were meetings were held to receive the deputation, before thousands of the people, and before very many of the ministers, I declared my conviction that they had been criminal in not using the power they possessed against slavery. And at the last meeting we had—the valedictory service—in New York, where there were 2000 or 3000 persons present, and 70 or 80 ministers, my very last sentence was to this effect, that I hoped the churches of that land were so convinced of the evil of slavery that when other deputations visited them, those deputations would find that there was not a slave in that republican country; and," continued Dr. Mattheson, "the chief friends of the Abolition Society of New York the morning after called upon me and expressed their full and entire gratification that I had been enabled on that occasion to bear my testimony so freely and fully to the evil of slavery, and to their sinfulness in not using the influence they possessed to remove it" (hear, hear). That was the fact, and he (Mr. Thoresby) would leave the meeting to say whether Dr. Mattheson was a traitor to the abolition cause. The speaker next read a resolution, passed in 1840, by the Congregational Union, expressing, in the most emphatic terms, "its abhorrence of the crime of slave-holding, and deep conviction of its repugnance to Christianity;" imploring their American brethren, for the honour of Christianity, "calmly to consider the deep guilt in which their system of slavery involved them," &c. He continued—He placed those facts before them, and left them. He hoped the British churches would moot the question—he hoped they would openly express their sentiments, and he hoped, too, that they would appeal to the Free Church in Scotland and implore its members to send back the money it had got from the slave states in America (cheers). A friend of his had just placed in his hand a few lines of appeal to the Scotch Church, with which he would conclude his observations—

Send back the price of blood;
Let not the accursed thing
Pollute the coffers of your God.
He hates an offering
Wrung from enslaved men
By iron cruelty.
Send back the price of bondage, then,
Bright though the gold coins be.

Ye would not wear the yoke
Of bondage less severe,
Nobly the galling chains ye broke—
Brave-hearted men ye were;
Do ye not feel for men
Crushed down by slavery?
Send back the price of bondage, then,
Bright though the gold coins be.

Let your great voice be heard
Across the Atlantic main;
Utter the stern, decisive word—
"The gold comes back again;
We cannot take the price
Of human wrong and blood—
We dare not place this sacrifice
Before our holy God." (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. A. Stone briefly seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted.

Mr. H. C. Howells having lived in America for eleven years, during ten years of which the abolition conflict was most severe, bore testimony in a clever speech to the self-denying labours of Mr. Garrison, who, with other leaders of the abolition movement, had reduced himself to the condition of a slave for the sake of the three millions in bondage. He was hated by his countrymen—who were ready to sacrifice his life—and he lived always in peril, having no security but that Almighty power by which he had been sustained.

J. B. Estlin, Esq., in moving the next resolution, said it could not be expected that a people which held three millions of their countrymen in bondage would be very scrupulous in their means of supporting a system which commenced in robbery and was continued in cruelty and oppression; they had, therefore, not only made very stringent laws for their own coloured people, but had passed enactments which even affected the subjects of this country. Mr. Estlin explained that, by the laws of the southern states, any coloured person, from whatever part of the world, was held in gaol while his vessel staid in any southern port; and, in the event of his not paying the costs, he might be sold into slavery: and moved a resolution asking our government to remonstrate with America on the subject of those laws.

J. E. Lunell, Esq., seconded the resolution, which was passed *nem. con.*

The Rev. W. James, in moving the next resolution, recommended the carrying out a plan which had been determined upon at meetings at Bridgwater and Exeter, namely, for the inhabitants of cities and towns in England, after which towns in America had been called, to send addresses in favour of abolition to the inhabitants of those towns.

Edward Thomas, Esq., seconded the motion.

Elihu Burritt ("the learned blacksmith") came forward, and was received with long-continued plaudits—He said he was happy that the proposition had been submitted to the meeting, for it came within the circumference of the idea of universal government. It was a pleasing and affecting circumstance that the settlers in New England, in the names which they gave to their new homes in the new world, designed to raise up monuments to the homes they had left behind them in their fatherland (applause). This was a circumstance which, in common with his friend Douglass, he rejoiced at. He had often contemplated with emotions of the deepest pleasure the fact that in Great Massachusetts almost every town settled before the revolutionary war was called after some endeared name in the fatherland; and most happy should he be to aid in calling up those feelings of kindred and sympathy which such a circumstance was likely to awaken (cheers). But recently a similarly happy interchange of sentiment between the two countries to that now presented had taken place in reference to the question of peace (hear, hear). When it was feared that the two countries were fast sliding towards war, and assuming a belligerent position in regard to each other, the friends of love and concord stretched out their arms as it were across the great Atlantic, shook hands, and pledged each other to endeavour to ensure the continuance of friendly and brotherly relations. The moral effect of that proceeding would outlive the present generation, and would, he hoped, tend to the happiness and glory of both countries (cheers). Most heartily did he support the proposition that the men and women of cities in England should send addresses to the men and women of namesake towns in America—addresses at once paternal and fraternal—to awaken old associations which still existed, and which only required to be touched by the magic wand of friendship to be made to respond to the good wishes which they would send across the Atlantic. He believed that brotherly good will, genuine philanthropy, and

love for our fellow-creatures were fast becoming the great powers which would pull down the strongholds of iniquity (cheers). He believed in his heart that their solicitations and expostulations, breathed in the good name of brotherhood, would not be like water spilled upon the ground, but would come back to their bosoms, bearing a friendly response to all the feelings of Christian love they had sent forth (cheers).

The CHAIRMAN having briefly expressed a hope that there would be many contributions from England to the Boston bazaar in aid of the abolition cause, said, if there was any gentleman present who wished to offer any remarks, the meeting would now hear him.

C. H. GREENLY, Esq. came forward to offer a few words in explanation, on behalf of the body with which he was connected (the Wesleyan Methodists). A statement was made by Mr. Douglass, at the last meeting, concerning that section of the Christian church, which some of his friends had felt to be incorrect. He (Mr. Greenly) did not himself consider that the statement was substantially incorrect (hear). Mr. Douglass stated what, substantially, he considered was true—that the Wesleyan Methodists of England had not consented to withhold all intercourse from the slaveholding churches in America. They had not withdrawn all intercourse, and the statement was substantially true; but the meeting possessing but very limited information on the subject, it was a statement calculated to produce a wrong impression (hear). It was very well known that the Wesleyan body had long been connected with the missions in the West Indies, and that it was very early connected with the abolition movement—that its name was referred to by Mr. Wilberforce and his enlightened coadjutors as supporters of that movement—that, 30 years ago, a minister, having possessed himself of a slave, was expelled—that, sixteen years ago, the body passed a resolution, that it was a breach of the religion of Jesus Christ for men to hold in bondage their fellowmen—that, subsequently, a strong remonstrance was sent to the conference in America on the subject (hear); and that the only communion now held with the American churches depended on the recurrence of the conference. The remonstrance sent out was deemed very unpleasing, and a letter was sent back in reply; in consequence of which a deputation was sent out. Of the proceedings of that deputation he was not at all aware, but he was of a succeeding one, in 1840, when Doctor Newton went through the towns of America, conversing with the people and declaring openly against the sin of slavery. Since that time no deputation had come from America, nor had any been sent out. It had been said that there was a division on the subject between the northern and the southern Wesleyan churches in America; but the only thing he could find was that the northern churches had declared that no minister holding slaves should be one of the four general bishops of that body. They still admitted that ministers holding slaves in states where the law did not allow of their emancipating them, should not be required to expatriate themselves; but he (Mr. Greenly) believed that a Christian church should not connect itself with iniquity in any state (cheers); that it ought to be free from every spot; and that, for the sake of Christian duty, its ministers and members should be prepared to endure difficulties, which were not greater than the difficulties of the primitive church in reference to idolatry. He was ready to avow that the Methodist body was, to a certain degree, criminal, not having done all it should do in refusing to hold intercourse with members of slaveholding churches. Other churches were also as guilty. The Wesleyan body had used great exertions to raise the character of the negro, which should not be forgotten, and the Methodists were among the first movers in the great cause of emancipation (hear). He was only anxious that the Wesleyan body should bear no more than its fair share of blame, and that other churches which seemed to exult at what was said the other night, should not refuse to bear their fair share (hear). He believed the Secession Church of Scotland to be absolutely called upon to cleanse itself from the defilement it had incurred, and to return the blood-stained money it had received (applause).

W. PHILLIPS, Esq., also rose to defend the Methodist Conference from the accusation made at the last meeting. He thought he was fully prepared to meet it, and although his friend Greenly had admitted that the body had incurred a certain degree of blame, he did not himself know what the Methodist Conference could have done more than it had done. The Methodist Conference of England could not remonstrate till it had purged itself by emancipating the slaves in the British possessions. In 1835 it sent a powerful remonstrance against slavery to the bishops of the church in America. He had that document, and also the reply of the American General Conference, which was not satisfactory. In the following year the English Conference addressed a very powerful reply to it, and it would be impossible to adopt more decided language of condemnation than was used by the Conference against the sin of slavery. In 1839 Dr. Newton visited the churches in America, speaking against slavery everywhere, and on his return he received the thanks of the Conference, especially for his fidelity in stating the unaltered and unalterable sentiments of that body on the subject of slavery. Dr. Fiske in that Conference was a representative of America. Observations being made against slavery, he ventured something in extenuation of the system, and was met by one unanimous burst of indignation, and Dr. Bunting turned to him and said, "You see what the feeling is. You can convey to the brethren in America what is the feeling of the English Conference on the subject of slavery." He (Mr. Phillips) was unwilling to occupy the time of the meeting; but if he were to read all the documents he could convince them that the Wesleyan Conference had done all it could do on the subject of slavery (no, no, and hear). He was not aware of the exact nature of the division of the northern and southern churches in America; it might be as his friend Greenly had said, although he had understood that it was a division upon the question of slavery. He was not sufficiently informed on the subject to venture a more positive statement. He had in his hand a copy of a minute from the minute-book of the Conference at Leeds. It was dated July 31st, 1845. A member of the Virginian conference had presented himself for admittance, and because he was connected with the pro-slavery churches he was refused (hear, hear, hear). Was not that a triumphant refutation of the charge that the Methodists were in full communion with slave-holding churches? A similar thing also occurred with the Irish Conference, and at the last Conference in this city no less than three ministers from America, on presenting themselves, were asked by the president whether they were for or against slavery: if they had been pro-slavery ministers they would have been excluded. He wanted to know what the Conference could do more? (a voice—"no compromise.") No compromise! there was no compromise. Surely they would not have the English body make war upon the American churches. All they could do was to offer Christian remonstrances. In the approaching General Conference in 1848, if the American churches did not do what morality and religion required, no doubt the Conference of this country would refuse all communion with them.

No other speaker presenting himself—

MR. F. DOUGLASS was called upon by the chairman to reply, and, on presenting himself, he was received with the most vehement cheering. He said he never rose to address an audience with a deeper sense of responsibility than he felt at that moment. He was there as the representative of three millions of people, who were held in the most abject slavery in the United States of America. He was there, also, in part as the representative of a people who, for three hundred years, had been the common prey of the Christian world. He might say that he represented Africa—deeply wronged Africa—Africa, who had been plundered of her children for three hundred years, in the name of the Bible (hear, hear)—Africa which, for three centuries, had been the very hunting ground of the Christian nations. If he should speak warmly on the subject no man would dare to rise up in that assembly and say he had not had cause to speak warmly (cheers). Evidently a deep feeling had been stirred up in the hearts of the community; that vast gathering implied no mean interest in the great question to be considered. He felt the more deeply the responsibility resting upon him. Called upon to do justice to his brethren in bonds, he was endeavouring, as far as he could, to remember them as bound with them (hear, hear). To know their thoughts, to have their feelings, and to speak their words, for it was with the injured that Christ would have them identify themselves—with the slaves, not with the slaveholders—remembering not "those who bind as binding with them," but "those in bonds as bound with them" (cheers). Having said thus much, he would come immediately to the subject in debate. It seemed to him that a simple statement from him at the commencement of the meeting might have been sufficient to render unnecessary many of the remarks which had been made. He had said nothing about the Methodists of this country which could justify the remarks either of Mr. Greenly or of the friend on his left (Mr. Phillips). What he said of them was true, and he said it still. They were now in fellowship with the Methodist church in the United States, which church hugged to its communion men bloody with the guilt of slavery. He said not this as charging the Methodists of England particularly; he had merely stated it as a fact, in order that the Methodists of England, when possessed of a knowledge of the facts, might act according to the light of that knowledge. He was not desirous of criminating any body of Christians; the truth he was bound to declare. It was not necessary to tell him nor the meeting what had been done by the Methodists for the removal of slavery from the West Indies; he had never accused that church of any want of effort in that cause. What he had said was, that they were in fellowship with the Episcopal Methodist church in America—that he said now, and it was not answered by the fact that the Leeds conference had rejected a minister from Virginia. That did not settle the question at issue, and he would tell them why it did not. Neither was the question stated that which was asked. It was not, "Are you a slave-holder yourself, or connected with slave-holding?" but "Did you go off to the south?" He appealed to the friend on his left whether the question was not, "Are you with the church of the north or the south?" and on his answering "With the church of the south," he was refused communion, not so much for being in favour of slavery as for being a schismatic from the church. He had no desire to place the Methodists prominently before the meeting, they must thank themselves if he gave them a short history of their proceedings. In 1784 the Methodist church in the United States was openly and unequivocally an anti-slavery church. It preached emancipation as the right of the slave and the duty of the master; it made it incumbent on those applying for fellowship and communion to emancipate their slaves; and, in the annual and gene-

ral conference, it appointed committees to draw up petitions to the several legislatures in whose states slavery existed for emancipation. This mode of action, however, soon perished; it was seen that if they pursued this course they must leave the slaveholding states; that they must either take slaveholders into communion, or array against themselves a prejudice which they could not easily oppose. They admitted slaveholders; they had ministers slaveholders; they became a pro-slavery church. In the year 1836 they came to this resolution—"Resolved, that we wholly disapprove of abolition, and wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention to interfere with the relation of master and slave as it at present exists in the slave states" (cries of "shame"). That they had no right, no wish, no intention, to do what? No right, wish, or intention to give freedom to three millions in bondage. Those three millions were on their knees, imploring them, as ministers of the most High God, to lift up their voices like trumpets against the daring iniquity which held them in bondage; imploring them to tell the slaveholder that it was his duty to set them free; and the answer which they received was —"We have no right, wish, or intention, to interfere with the relation of master and slave as it at present exists." To leave 1836, and come to a later period: in 1840 the general conference, which met once in four years, assembled in the city of Boston. During that conference the case of Silas Comfort, one of the ministers of the west, came before them. He was a minister on a circuit in Missouri, and he had a difficulty in his church, in which a coloured man's testimony was necessary to convict of criminality a white man of his church. He admitted that testimony; the white man was convicted, and Silas Comfort, as an honest man, excommunicated him. The man appealed to the general conference, which came to this resolution—"Resolved, that it is inexpedient and unjustifiable for any minister of a church to admit a coloured man's testimony against a white person (hisses) in those states where they are denied that privilege by law" (hear, and shame). What was—what must be the effect of that resolution? Any member of a Christian church having a white skin—any deacon, or elder, or doctor of divinity —might go into the house where a coloured member, of whom there were 8000, lived—might go into the house of a black brother in the church and in Christ Jesus—might trample on him, wrong him, insult his wife, violate all the rules of decency in his presence, and yet that injured brother, because of the colour of his skin, might not testify the truth against the white wrongdoer (hear). But let him come to the last general conference in 1844. He happened to be at New York, and at several of its sessions. He saw the Rev. Dr. Smith, the slaveholder of Virginia, stand upon the floor, and plead for slavery by the hour; he saw sixty ministers, all slaveholders; he saw Bishop Andrew there, a slaveholder. To come, now, to the division which had been spoken of. Something had been hinted about it, but his friend on his left was not very clear concerning it (a laugh). He said this, not sneeringly: it was not to be expected that those whose eyes were not fixed upon the matter should understand it; but then, they should hesitate and hear long before they rose up in a congregation to dispute what they heard (hear). They should hear long before they denied, for a little more investigation might teach them prudence. In the northern states, since the abolition movement arose, several local bodies of Congregationalists, Methodists, and others had dissolved all connexion with slavery; and in 1837 a number of honest men felt that they could no longer brook the rule of that church and seceded; but mark! the British conference never joined in fellowship with that body. Those men left all, gave up their book and superannuation funds, and everything for the sake of Christ and humanity. They did nobly: never had he spoken a word but in their praise, and whenever any other body pursued the same inflexible Christian course, as loud would he be found in its praise as he was in that of the "True Wesleyans." They sounded the alarm in the northern states, and they called upon the Methodists of the north to come out of the old Methodist church, because she said she had no right, wish, or intention, to give the Bible to three millions of people—to give the marriage institution to them—or to release them from bondage (applause). Because she said that 8000 of her members, having coloured skins and having been received by baptism into the church of God, should not be allowed the privilege of testifying the truth against their fellows. They called upon them to come out of her, because, as long as they were in her, they formed so many bricks in the great wall which kept in bondage three millions of human beings. Such was their cry; but, moreover, they said, come out of her also because the sin of slavery is gaining supremacy in every part of the church—because the blood of slavery is everywhere in the church—because not only members but class-leaders and deacons and bishops are the holders of slaves (applause). What followed? The northern churches felt that if they did not do something to look like anti-slavery the whole of the members in the north would leave their communion; and, accordingly, they went down and attacked Bishop Andrew (hear), who had got 15 slaves by his marriage, and who, although he had the power to emancipate them, said he would not do so. They passed this resolution, "Whereas Bishop Andrew has connected himself with slavery, and has thereby injured his itinerantcy as a bishop"—mark that! not invested himself with the sin and guilt of slavery, but injured his itinerantcy; for they knew if he came to the north with the blood of 15 slaves on his garment, that there would have been "a noise," as they called it in America (hear). "Resolved, therefore, that Bishop Andrew be, and he is hereby requested"—not suspended or excluded, but—"requested to suspend his labours as bishop until he can get rid of his impediment" (laughter and applause). In America they had a way of coining a great many soft names to hide the real character of slavery—they called it "our social system," "our domestic institution," "our patriarchal institution," "our peculiar institution" (laughter), but it was left for the Wesleyan Methodists to find a new name, and it was now no longer either of those, but "the impediment" (renewed laughter). One might almost think that they meant the good bishop's wife—for he got his slaves by marriage (shouts of laughter). This resolution was discussed—how long did they think?—three weeks. A man who had stolen a sheep they would have cut off in five minutes. It was only after three weeks, and after a series of prayer-meetings, love-feasts, and fastings that they could come to the solemn conclusion that Bishop Andrew should be requested to suspend his labours as bishop until he could get rid of "the impediment" (laughter). The conference adopted the resolution, and the day after the southern ministers declared they could have nothing to do with the north, and, by way of undoing all that had been done, several questions were put to the conference by Bishop Waugh. He (Mr. Douglass) knew him well—he used to pray with his mistress when he was a slave. They could see that he knew something of his Methodist brethren (laughter). He meant no imputation upon the Methodists of England—he was speaking of the Methodist church in the United States. There was a great stir among the bishops, and Bishop Waugh asked—Shall Bishop Andrew's name remain among the other bishops in the minutes of conference, book of discipline, and hymn book? The answer was—"Resolved, that Bishop Andrew's name shall be retained." The second question was—Shall Bishop Andrew do any work during the recess of conference, and if any, what work shall Bishop Andrew do? It was answered that Bishop Andrew was left to decide for himself whether he should do any work, and what. He had only "injured his itinerantcy" in the northern states, and a door by this answer was left open to him to labour in the southern states. The next question was—Shall Bishop Andrew have any support and, if any, how shall he be supplied during the coming four years? The answer was—that Bishop Andrew be supplied out of the funds of the church, as the other bishops. After commenting on the resolutions, the speaker went on to observe that he had felt called upon to let the British churches know the truth. They had heard of ultra measures being taken by the abolitionists, but they at first found the whole country dead upon the subject of slavery except the Covenanters, and the Quakers—he would speak of them by and by. Those bodies had been nearly clear for the last century of slavery, and the Covenanters had refused to swear allegiance to the constitution, and had thereby disfranchised themselves, because the oath bound them to take up arms against slaves trying to emancipate themselves (hear, hear). The principal churches were the Methodist, Baptist, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians. In 1845 the Methodists numbered 250,000 slaves; the Baptists, 125,000; the Presbyterians, 80,000; and the Episcopalians, 80,000 to 90,000. Finding the churches interwoven with slavery, the abolitionists took up the strong ground of Christianity, and had laboured the last 15 years to show that slavery was a sin, and ought not to be upheld by Christians. It had been said that the abolitionists wished to set up a new test of eligibility for Christian communion —they did not; they only asked the churches to consistently carry out the tests they had set up themselves, and not only to exclude the man who picked pockets, but those who stole men, pockets and all (cheers). After denouncing, in terms of eloquent indignation, the slaveholders as menstealers, and arguing that no human laws could violate the laws of God and give a right of property in man—he contended that Christians were bound to emancipate the slaves, and if they could not do so in one state, they were called upon to do so in another. If a slaveholder wished to emancipate his slaves, he could readily do so. He had only to call them out in the night, beneath the star-spangled canopy of heaven, and, selecting one from among them all, to say, "That is the north star, beneath its twinkling light there is a free country, the country of Victoria (cheers). Steer by its course, and be cheered by its silvery light —sleep in the day—fly in the night—hide in the lofty pines when you shall hear the horn of the driver calling into the field the long lines of your enslaved brethren—follow the course of yonder star, and ere three weeks have passed over your heads your chains shall be broken asunder, and you shall stand before man free, emancipated, disenthralled" (loud cheers). There was no difficulty, the slaveholders might emancipate their slaves if they would, and that at once (cheers). A good deal had been said about deputations. He wished he was better acquainted with the deputations to the United States, but, unfortunately, Brother Hall held him too long in slavery for him to be thoroughly acquainted with their history. He had, however, read a little, and what he had read he tried to remember. The speaker here recalled that the morrow (Thursday) was the anniversary of his emancipation, and detailed, in eloquent language, the hopes, fears, and anxieties by which he was beset on

the eve of the memorable day which was to decide his destiny and give him life and liberty or unending slavery (hear, hear). He returned to his subject. An extract had been read from the speech of Dr. Mattheson, and he would wish to tread lightly on the memory of Dr. Mattheson: he was gone to his reward, and let his deeds pass; but he would speak the truth of living deputations. He would begin with the Free-Church deputation (hear). There had yet to be any religious deputation from this country to America which had ever made themselves odious to the slave states—there had not been one (hear). While 5000 dollars were offered for the head of William Lloyd Garrison, because of his unceasing opposition to slavery, the religious deputation from England passed through the south—were taken by the hands in the very heart of slavery—welcomed to the pulpits of the slave churches—were paid money, and came out without the smell of fire upon their garments. When George Thompson, with eloquence never surpassed, pleaded, on the shores of America, the cause of the oppressed slave, he was threatened with assassination; violent mobs clamoured against him; and the slaveholders were full of bloody determination to take his life. But the reverend deputation—Dr. Cox and the rest of the tribe—were received as brethren, and now came home to England to tell how they hated slavery. That was the fact, and he could prove that it was not because slaveholders ever compromised their principles. The speaker quoted largely from American publications, to show the violent hatred to abolitionists entertained in the slave states; he also referred to the murder of Lovejoy, who was shot for opposing slavery; to the persecution of Amos Dresser, who was whipped by elders of the Presbyterian church; to the persecutions of Charles T. Torrey and John L. Brown, for befriending the slaves; and continued —The whole south was hot with bloody determination against abolitionists, and did they believe—he put it to their common sense—that men could do what these reverend deputations had done, and be faithful? (no, and applause.) He came next to the Quaker deputation, and he would not speak the less freely of them because their worthy chairman was of that body, nor would he if the whole meeting belong to it. He came to speak the truth of that deputation. In the early days of anti-slavery in America the Friends, seeing the struggle going on for emancipation, flocked around the abolition standard. Their influence was great. John G. Whittier, one of the noblest of the earth, stood forward in behalf of the slave, and he and others subjected themselves to the violence of the pro-slavery populace. Violent mobs arose; their lives were threatened; Pennsylvania-hall was burnt, because it was a place for holding abolition meetings; property was destroyed; mobocracy prevailed, and Lynch law was uppermost, and the question arose —"Can the Society of Friends bear it?" They at once issued an address counselling the members to abstain from all abolition movement out of the society, and they advised that their meeting-houses should not be opened for abolition meetings; and while they said one word against slavery they aimed two at the abolitionists. When Jamess Canning Fuller came to Lyme for the purpose of saying a few words to his brethren of the society against slavery, he was refused, and they would not allow one of their own brethren to speak of the evils of slavery in one of their own meeting-houses (hear). Very well—Joseph Sturge came out, endorsed by British Friends. No one could doubt his sincerity as a Quaker any more than they could his truthfulness as an abolitionist. He went to the United States to speak to his brother Friends on the subject of slavery, and what did they do? They shut their doors against him. They had done more than that. They went to the extent of setting members aside, silencing elders, and proscribing officers, for no other offence than because those parties had interfered against slavery (hear). The consequence was, that about 600 members separated, determined to endure the tyranny of the general body no longer. They sent an epistle to London, and he was told it was not received. Things went on till the deputation was sent out, whose consistency of character he would admit was, up to the time of the deputation, irreproachable. He was not going to arraign their motives, but to tell the truth. Instead of treating both parties as equal, they treated those who had seceded as schismatics, and called upon them to come back. Come back to where? To where they found the slave excluded from the meeting-house; to the place where Joseph Sturge was not allowed to speak; where Henry Clay, the duellist, the slaveholder, the robber of the rights of sixty of his fellow-creatures, was to be found. They did not come back (cheers); and though discountenanced by the deputation, and discountenanced by the body of Friends, they were worthy of all honour (cheers). The speaker went on in justice to state that the body of Friends in general were known in the United States as the friends of the negro, and that if a slave escaped there was no house in which he could find so much safety as in that of the straight coat and broad brim. Having illustrated this fact by an interesting anecdote, he proceeded to state that the Episcopalian Church was mixed up with slavery in an infamous degree, and quoted from a sermon by Bishop Mead, of Virginia, in which he laid down some most unscriptural doctrines—that slaves were bound to yield the same service to their masters as to God, and that faults against their masters and mistresses were against God himself. That if they were punished for an offence they had not committed they must bear it patiently, as God had sent it for some other offence, and their masters and mistresses were God's overseers on earth. The text, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do you even so unto them," he interpreted to mean, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you if you were in their place and they in yours;" or, said Mr. Douglass, as you, if you were a robber, would like another man to give his purse to you, so being the robbed, deliver yours over to him. The speaker then referred to the deputation from the Free Church of Scotland, which he had to charge with turning a deaf ear to the groans of the slaves, and preaching such doctrines as were palatable in a slave state. They had received the blood money of the slaves—they saw the slave trampled on, and were dumb, and uttered not a word against the atrocities they saw surrounding them. The Free Church must give back that money (hear). The Baptists, also, except that portion of them which he had referred to as having dissolved from slavery, were also mixed up with slavery. All consistent Christians, if they excluded the sheepstealer from their communion, were bound to exclude the manstealer (hear, hear, and cheers). He said nothing of the Unitarians; he believed they did not exclude sheepstealers (laughter). He said this not in derision; he believed that they did not take upon themselves, as a body, to determine who should be excluded, and while they admitted any other thief, there was no reason why they should not admit a manstealer to communion. While they did not think they had a right to refuse any one who presented himself, they could exclude no one. Other communities should be consistent. He implored the meeting to exert itself in behalf of three millions of enslaved human beings, who, as they were sitting in that meeting, were being driven before the whip of the driver to the rice swamps, low and dank. He had four sisters and one brother groaning beneath the chains of slavery. He had, too, an aged grandmother, who, if she yet lived, was all alone and desolate. Her children had been all snatched from her to serve the southern plantations, which ever cried, "give, give," and, like the grave, never ceased crying. A generation of slaves in seven years died off in the rice swamps of Alabama; and if his aged grandmother lived she had to pine alone and grope about in her darkness for her humble meal and draught of water. Her lot was the lot of others, and he implored them in her name—in the name of millions like her—in the name of their common humanity and common Christianity, to do what they could do—and it was much—to put an end to slavery (hear, hear, and cheers). It was the prerogative of Britons to demand the right to give the Bible to every human being in the southern plantations of America, and while they demanded the right to preach the gospel beneath the very shadow of St. Peter's, and to send the blessed tidings of salvation to the Chinese and the Hindoo, would they not send it to their fellow-creatures within fourteen days' sail of their own green island? (cheers.) If they had whispered truth too long, let them whisper it no longer; let their voices swell like the voice of the tempest, sterner and louder, till America herself should know that while the plague-spot existed she could not be numbered among the Christian nations—that while the clank of the slave-chains were heard on her shore she should, in humility, pull down her star-spangled banner, and tear it in strips to bind up the wounds of her victims. Let them tell her of her flag in the language of Campbell—

> United States! Your banner wears
> Two emblems—one of fame;
> Alas, the other that it bears,
> Reminds us of your shame.
>
> The *white* man's liberty in types,
> Stands blazoned by your *stars*;
> But what's the meaning of your *stripes?*
> They mean your *negroes' scars.*

Thanks were then voted to Mr. Douglass and to the Chairman, and the meeting broke up at eleven o'clock.

American Slavery.—Extract of a letter dated Richmond, July 25, 1846—"An unpleasant occurrence took place in this city yesterday. A man who has a number of hired negroes in his employment was proceeding for some slight offence to punish one of them by whipping, when the poor wretch, knowing his master's unmerciful nature, implored that he might be hanged at once instead of whipped. This of course would not answer, and after tying the negro's hands behind him, in the usual manner, the employer went into another room to procure his cowhide, when the negro taking advantage of his absence rushed from the room, jumped into the river, and was drowned." *American paper.*

Patriot Sep. 17. 1846

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND SLAVERY.

SIR,—One is perfectly at a loss to account for the very feeble tone, on the subject of slavery, which has been adopted by the members of the Evangelical Alliance.

One speaker is reported to have said: "If you introduce a resolution against the admission of slaveholders, you will dissolve the Alliance." Yet no man rose and indignantly replied: "Let this Alliance be scattered to the winds, rather than that we should give any countenance to such an iniquitous system as that of slavery." And, at the last public meeting, the members were found to tolerate such a remark as this, from an American speaker, in reference to slaveholding: "They must not exalt matters of secondary and minor importance into essentials."

And now Mr. Alexander King, Independent minister, comes forward and insults the Convention, by calling slavery a "matter of opinion;" and, in his third protest, calls slaves "personal property." Would he be admitted to hold such language to any other body in Great Britain? Would he escape the withering sarcasm of Daniel O'Connell or Douglas Jerrold, had he dared to breathe such sentiments in their presence? Let Mr. Alexander King wear the collar for but one week, and, when driven to the cotton-field by the lash, be told the propriety or impropriety of this treatment is a mere "matter of opinion,"—I think he would soon decide that slaveholding is something more than a question of "personal property." But why so in his case, and not in that of the negro?

Then, Sir, we find a large body of Americans protesting against the exclusion of slaveholders from the society, because they were not informed that such would be the case previous to their voyage. Surely this plea can be of no avail. They ought to have known our sentiments—and that we should not be expected to fraternise with men living in the open commission of that sin. Duellists and gamblers might plead for admission on the same argument. These gentlemen say, in the fourth reason they have given for their protest, "If Christian brethren," coming into possession of slaves by no fault of their own, "conduct themselves worthily, they merit, on that account, in our view, the sympathy of their fellow-Christians." Undoubtedly so, and in our view also; but we consider that the immediate emancipation of those slaves would be the only conduct "worthy" of a Christian brother.

The Alliance excludes such men as Mr. Sturge and the late Mr. Foster, of Bristol—the one because he has not been baptised with water, and the other because he received the threats to the wicked (death, destruction, and perishing) in their literal sense;—yet admit the men whose whole lives are one continued course of robbery; thereby making it a greater crime to misunderstand the text, "The wages of sin is death," than to disregard the woe which is pronounced in another text against him who useth his neighbour's service without wages.

R.

ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.

A public meeting was held at Exeter-hall, on Monday evening, the 14th instant, by the members of this League, to review the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance in relation to American slavery and American slaveholders. The large room was densely crowded. A few minutes after six o'clock, W. H. Garrison, Esq., George Thompson, Esq., and Frederick Douglass, appeared on the platform, and were loudly cheered. Besides the gentlemen named, we observed the Revs. Dr. Campbell, Ferguson, Henderson, Jenkyn, and Price; Rev. Messrs. Philip (Maberly), Godwin (Highbury), Aveling, G. and S. Wilkin, Jefferson, Preston, Hammond (Westminster), Owen (Shadwell-street), Ainslie, Glanville, Stratten, Redpath, Arundel, Brown, and Hutchinson, (United States); Drs. Conquest and Oxley; Wm. and Mary Howitt, and Messrs. Luke Hansard, Ashurst, George and Thomas Sturge, J. Soul, G. Pilkington, Darby, and about 6,000 persons.

The agent of the Rajah of Sattara was also present, in native costume.

On the motion of Mr. R. SMITH, the Rev. J. Burnet was called to the chair.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said: The position which I occupy is to me an unusual one. I am generally either on the right or the left hand of this chair; but I have never before been placed precisely in this situation—very disagreeable to myself. The occasion upon which we are assembled is one of great importance to the cause of freedom and all its friends throughout the world. We have had meetings in this hall recently, of a body of persons for an object the noblest that could possibly come before us—the union of Christian brethren to promote the feelings of brotherhood; but it has occurred to some, that a fair opportunity, in keeping with this avowed object, was not furnished for extending the feelings of brotherhood to a race that has long been under a very different influence from that of brotherly kindness and charity; and that an opportunity was not only lost, but lost under circumstances which showed that the parties concerned were not inattentive to the importance of considering brotherly kindness and charity as belonging to slaves as well as to freemen. The question of slavery was not altogether overlooked—it was introduced and largely discussed, and a resolution was adopted concerning it—a resolution at which I am not surprised that all parties at last looked with some degree of regret; namely,—that all might be brethren in Christ, and treated as such by the Evangelical Alliance, who, either hold slaves against their will, or, who held them not for their own interests. It does not appear to me that a man is to be received into the arms of Christian brotherhood, because he tells you that he is a criminal against his will; or, because he tells you that he is punishing his fellow-man not for his own interest. For men to say, "we do it not for our own interest, while still we are criminals; and, therefore, we have a right to the acknowledgements of Christian brotherhood," appears to me an absurdity. (Cheers.) That resolution was at last withdrawn, it was rescinded by the Alliance, and the whole question was left in abeyance. If the American brethren should return to their own country, and give that country to understand that in England slavery is a question which Christians here will hold in abeyance, they will inflict a great wrong upon the slaves of that country. We have met, therefore, this evening to tell our American friends that the judgment of the Alliance is not the judgment of England. (Loud cheers.) That was the judgment of but a comparatively small number, though gathered from different parts of the three kingdoms, as well as from

America and the Continent. A verdict of these excellent individuals therefore, however worthy they may be, upon the American slave question, that would lead the American brethren to suppose that it can be put in abeyance, must not be regarded either as the decision of this great empire or as the decision of Europe; and to-night you will have an opportunity of knowing, that it is not even the decision of America itself. (Cheers.) You will find from Mr. Garrison, himself an American, from Frederick Douglass, a slave from America, who will bring before you the views of the abolitionists there, that there is, even in America itself, a feeling by no means unworthy of your admiration against the course pursued by the Alliance. I will not occupy your time, when you are to receive so much American intelligence. I will only say, for myself, that I have never had but one idea with regard to slavery for now nearly thirty years that I have been opposing it in England; and that my idea has been, that, in all cases, it is a crime, and a crime which no assembly of human beings ought to countenance—a crime which no assembly of Christians ought to pass by without the severest denunciation. I ought to state, in fairness to the Alliance, that the principal persons acting in it have been invited by circular to attend on this occasion. We do not ask for justice for the slave without seeking at the same time to do justice to those who would maintain slavery. (Cheers.)

W. L. Garrison, Esq., then rose and said: I can sincerely say, that I feel deeply embarrassed on the present occasion, not because I do not stand here in a good cause, or that I have so little say, but because of the magnitude of the object which has brought us together, and because I find it in my heart to say so much, while the time which is to be occupied is necessarily so brief. If ever I have desired to "remember those who are in bonds as bound with them," if ever I have desired strength adequate to meet a great and solemn emergency, it is on this occasion. But I am painfully conscious of my inability to do justice either to my own feelings, or to the subject which we have met to consider.

"For I have neither wit, nor worth, nor words,
Action, nor utterance, nor the power of speech,
To stir men's blood."——

but can only speak "right on"—

"Show you the bondman's wounds, poor, poor dumb mouths,
And bid them speak for me!"

I profess to be the representative and advocate of three millions of the American people, who are held in the galling chains of slavery. I wish to feel with them, and to remember that their eyes are upon me. Oh, that you might see them, in all their wretchedness and suffering, that your hearts might thereby be moved as the heart of one man, and that you might be made to realise what American slavery is in deed and in truth! The occasion is one of the deepest importance—one which will attract the attention of all Christendom, in due season. There has recently been convened, in this city, an imposing body of delegates from various parts of the civilised world, calling itself "The Evangelical Alliance," and challenging universal attention and homage for its Christian character and designs. Such a body must necessarily be powerful for good or evil. We are met to review its proceedings, with special reference to the foul and iniquitous system of American slavery. But how do we meet? Not for a sectarian purpose, or to indulge any feelings of dislike, because, peradventure, we may have been shut out of the Alliance, in consequence of the creed laid down, by which members should be admitted. We are here to look at the action of the Alliance, not caring what may be its religious profession or faith, in regard to a system of iniquity and oppression unparalleled in the history of the world. This I confidently affirm, that the members of no sect or party have it in their power to say, that, in the prosecution of the Anti-slavery cause in the United States, I have been partial, or have allowed this political party or that religious sect to pass unscathed, if I believed it pro-slavery in spirit or conduct. For the sake of the slave I long since gave up party and sect, and will know nothing of either till the jubilee comes, and there is not a slave in the wide world. (Cheers.) We meet here, then, to concede to the Alliance all that it claims as a religious body. We will judge it by its own standard, not ours, and thus determine whether it deserves the approbation of the Christian public, or whether it has not been false to all its professions, and is henceforth to be regarded with condemnation and execration by all the friends of true Christianity throughout the world. If the Alliance had been formed for a particular purpose, to deal with a particular evil, and that purpose and that evil had not been with reference to slavery, then no man could have complained of it, that it did not take up the question of slavery. But I desire all who are here to remember, that the Alliance claims to cover the whole ground of Christianity—to be the representative of Jesus Christ on the earth, and, of course, if animated by his spirit, having for its work the redemption of the whole human race. It seems to me proper, however, even on this occasion, to glance at the glaring discrepancy which existed between the profession and practice of the Alliance in regard to religious faith and character—proper, because in proportion as we convict that body of dereliction to its own standard, its ability to do mischief will be lessened; and because it virtually denied the Christian name to such as were not represented in it, and could not subscribe to its creed. Now, 1,800 years ago, it cost something for men to declare themselves the followers of Christ; the name "Christian" was one of reproach; but the times are altered, and he is a bold man now, who is willing to repudiate the Christian faith. To profess to believe in Christianity is now fashionable and popular; and few are found willing to be recognised as infidels, or as not being within the pale of religion. Let us judge this Alliance, then, by its words and its acts. I will read one of the propositions adopted by that body, which seems to me to bring just condemnation on it with regard to its religious course—"That, while they believe it highly desirable that Christians of different bodies, holding the head, should own each other as brethren by some such means as the Evangelical Alliance affords, the members of the Alliance disclaim the thought that these only, who openly join this society, are sincere friends to the cause of Christian union; that, on the contrary, they regard all those as its true friends, who solemnly purpose in their hearts, and fulfil that purpose in their practice, to be more watchful in future against occasions of strife, more tender and charitable towards Christians from whom they differ, and more constant in prayer for the union of all the true disciples of Christ." Observe—they do not here assume that they are a body composed exclusively of the Christians of the world, or of those which represent the Christians of the world. Then, I ask them, how they dared to exclude Christians from an Alliance which professed to seek the redemption of the world? They say, that they go for the union of all Christians upon the face of the earth; and then they begin by putting up a barrier, by which they exclude multitudes of people, whom afterwards they are constrained to recognise as Christians, lest they should be deemed uncharitable! Why did they not call themselves a Chris-

tian Alliance, instead of assuming a technical, invidious, and exclusive appellation? They excluded the whole body of the Society of Friends, agreeing with them in every fundamental doctrine, and simply because they do not observe particular ordinances. They are, therefore, condemned out of their own mouth, on the score of religious charity. I ask, again, in what light the Evangelical Alliance claims to be regarded in the world? As a body composed of those who are first and foremost in the work of promoting Christianity? By that standard, then, let them be judged; and, if it shall be found, in regard to the most frightful system of oppression and blood and heathenism that exists on earth, that they have no testimony to bear against it, even when it is urged upon their consideration, then, it seems, that this case is made out,—that, whoever else may be prepared to go forward in the work of regenerating the world, the Evangelical Alliance is not that body, but it has undertaken to perform a work which God never gave it to do. They claim to have met by the special will of God, under the influences of the Holy Ghost. If it were so, then it would have been made manifest in all their conduct. I will read an extract from a speech, delivered at one of its public meetings in this hall by the Hon. Justice Crampton:—"After days, weeks, and months of devout meditation, anxious preparation, and solemn conference and communication; after many prayers and tears, and in the midst of thanksgivings, that great Evangelical Union was formed. He was not rash in saying, here again was the hand of God visibly manifested to every thinking mind. Who, he would ask, put it into the hearts and minds of so many men, in such distant parts, to feel, almost at the same time, this strong desire for union,—this anxious yearning after Christian love? How was this effect produced simultaneously in so many breasts? Surely it was the work of God's Holy Spirit. Well, the Evangelical Association was formed, and was now before them. It was composed of men of every sect and denomination." I wonder if the Society of Friends is a denomination? (Hear, hear.) I wonder if the Unitarians are a denomination?—(marks of disapprobation and cheers)—and so of many others.

A gentleman here rose on the platform, and wished to reply to the speaker.

The Chairman stated that, in a deliberative assembly, it was impossible that an individual could be allowed to rise and give a reply upon every sentence; but if any gentleman wished to address the meeting, he would be heard at a proper time and in a proper way. They did not desire to silence discussion, but to prevent confusion.

Mr. Garrison resumed. In naming other denominations, or those which claim to be such, I said nothing to endorse their Christian character; and why any one should cry out, when I mention a particular denomination, as though I endorsed its Christian character, I cannot tell. The reason why I read these extracts is, that I wish to show, that the late Alliance claimed to be a body inspired by the Holy Ghost; and yet it passed by three millions of my down-trodden enslaved countrymen, as unworthy of their consideration, and their cruel oppressors as deserving no rebuke. Thus, by their claim to Christian character of the highest kind, they gave a more fearful blow to the Anti-slavery movement in America, than they could have done if they had been an irreligious body. But I will finish the extract—"That it was composed of men of every sect and denomination, and, what was of more importance than numbers or zeal, they were all like the holy men on the day of Pentecost, of one mind and of one accord! Could this blessed result be accounted for on any mere human principle? Assuredly, God was in this movement. The Association now took its place beside the other great religious societies. Its basis was, 'the faith once delivered to the saints.'" I will now give an extract from another speaker, with regard to the character of that body, and you will see what is the exalted claim of the Alliance—"The movement was suggested by the Spirit of God; the men who came together were those who saw eye to eye, in regard to what was fundamental in Christianity." I therefore say, that it is all the more important to know what that body did, in regard to the welfare of the human race. One of the speakers said, they had formed the Evangelical Alliance "pre-eminently to please the Lord Jesus Christ." That was the routine; and if it be true, then we shall find that the members of that body are those who are willing to make themselves of no reputation for Christ's sake—those who do not fear to be regarded as disturbers of the public peace, and endeavouring to turn the world upside down. That speaker goes on to say—"They had been called together by no official authority, by no ecclesiastical authority, and by no civil authority. They had come at the call of Christ, uttered in the solitariness of their hearts. He believed that the great Head of the church had called them, and they had come up there in the solemn spirit of men obeying the voice of Christ." We shall see how they met their solemn responsibilities. Again: "They were organised for one thing alone—not for fighting and attacking, but for love; not for opposing, but for uniting. How large, how noble, how lovely was the object which the Evangelical Alliance had undertaken to accomplish!" I take it, that the fighting and attacking alluded to here, are terms descriptive of an intolerant and hateful spirit. Of course they met for no such warfare, if they came at the call of Christ. Well, they declare that they were organised to do the work of love. Now, Christian love is the most combative thing in the universe. They who possess it, and are inspired by it, have put on the whole armour of God, that they may give battle to everything that is hostile to truth, righteousness, and universal liberty. They are seeking out iniquity, wherever it has lodged itself, and giving men no peace in their sins, until they repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance. But another object of the Alliance is to promote Christian union. The Rev. J. Tod Brown said: "The church, in times past, had been but a chaos of contentions, a cauldron of bitterness, a camp of controversy; sect struggling with sect; doctor defying doctor; denomination devouring denomination; creed contradicting creed; love thrust into a corner, weeping in disgrace, and bigotry and wrath and malice and envy, like a legion of fiends, let loose and lording it over professing—ay, and Protestant—Christendom; till, instead of the fall of Babylon, they had had the folly and the fatality of Babel." (Hear.) Was the church of Christ ever in this frightful condition? We are told it was. Why, if any one, not connected with any religious body, had brought such charges as are here brought against the church at the present day, he would have been denounced as an infidel, and deemed unworthy of any place or position in society. However, I think, the representation is a true one in regard to the nominal church of Christ. But let me read the remainder of this extract—"When they contrasted what the church had been with what she might have been; her sickening and senseless disputations with her magnanimous destinies; the peace bequeathed her, with the perverseness that has distracted her; the love, that, like the attraction of cohesion, should have bound her together in one solid mass, with the lukewarmness and the dislike, that, like the force centrifugal, had broken her into fragments and flung her forth into distance and dismemberment; no wonder she has been

shorn of her strength; no wonder she has groped in blindest impotence; no wonder the Philistines have mocked and manacled her. Well might they cry, 'Ichabod! Ichabod!'" I read this passage to show, that the object of the Alliance was to exhibit the church of Christ in a new attitude, as no longer divided by things of no importance—as now perceiving all that Christianity required—as now coming to do the work that Christ came to perform in the persons of his disciples; and it only makes it the more melancholy when we come to ascertain the conclusions of the Alliance, in regard to the question of American slavery. We have here divisions in the church of Christ lamented, and represented as totally alien to the true character of the church. Now, what has been the fruitful occasion of all these divisions? Not a difference of opinion as to anything of practical importance, or with reference to existing evils in the world; but the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin—a blind and bigoted attachment to religious forms and ceremonies, and times and seasons, and verbal creeds. I looked with anxiety to the coming together of the Alliance, to see whether its members would agree to renounce their sectarian shibboleths, and cease to contend about their modes of faith and forms of worship, and unite in efforts to overthrow whatever tended to depress and injure the cause of our common humanity. And what is the result? One of the speakers, the Rev. John Haldane Stewart, rector of Linksfield, Surrey, said, "His love for the society was increased from its giving him liberty to be *as much a Churchman as ever;* he did not lose any attachment to the Church, from being a member of that Alliance, but he felt his heart drawn out in love to every one who loved Jesus Christ. He understood that there were only 250 clergymen of his church in the Alliance at present, but that was only fifty less than the body whom the Lord helped, under Gideon, to destroy the host of the Midianites; they went forth shouting with their trumpets, 'The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!'" Here is a reference to a case of extraordinary faith, courage, and determination of old. Well, how far the Evangelical Alliance imitated Gideon in faith and boldness we shall see before we get through the proceedings. To demonstrate the "unity" which reigned among its members, it adopted the following proposition:—"That, in this Alliance, it is distinctly declared, that no compromise of the views of any member, or sanction of those of others, on the points wherein they differ, is either required or expected; but that all are held as free as before to maintain and advocate their religious convictions, with due forbearance and brotherly love." You see, therefore, that although forms of church government, ordinances, ceremonies, and holy times have been the cause, in time past, of rending the church of Christ, and must produce the same disastrous effect in time to come, naturally or necessarily—still, they who came together in the Evangelical Alliance to promote Christian union were not willing to give up one of these things, and resolved that they would be just as much Churchmen, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians as they ever were before! It seems to me, that it is impossible to form a Christian Alliance under such circumstances. But, further: The Rev. P. M'Owen said, "In requiring good men, of all denominations, to unite with us in the principles of our basis and in carrying out our leading design, we ask for the sacrifice of no principle, for the abandonment of no conscientious conviction, for the renunciation of no religious preference. The Episcopalian is allowed to be Episcopalian still; the Presbyterian, a Presbyterian still; the Congregationalist, a Congregationalist still; and the Methodist, a Methodist still. We only require, Sir, that, in stating and in defending their denominational peculiarities, they speak the truth, and that they speak it in love." It seems, by this confession, that, hitherto, they have not spoken the truth in love, but have dealt in mutual defamation. Now, I have only to ask, on this point, if these sectarian names were not known in primitive times? and if the Alliance desires to exhibit and spread primitive Christianity, why did not that body put aside all these names, and say, henceforth we know each other as Christian men? (Cheers.) The object of the Convention is thus described by Dr. Craig:—"It comprehended within its ample field, not merely a family of men, a single nation; but every person, both Jew and Gentile, in the world." I am here to inquire, whether they included, in their regard, 3,000,000 of slaves in the United States? Or do these slaves constitute no part of the human family? Let us hear another of the delegates. The Rev. Dr. Emory, of Dickenson College, Pennsylvania, said: "I love and support the Alliance, not because it may contribute to the removal of any evil (!!) either social, or moral, or political; but I love it because it is right—because God has commanded it, through all his works, and in all his Word." As if God could possibly command anything which did not have something to do with the social, moral, or political evils of mankind! The Rev. G. W. Abbott, of America, said: "He came from a country as large as twenty-two such islands as that he was now in; they had twenty two independent sovereignties; twenty-two independent Parliaments; with various denominations of Christians, having 11,000,000 persons who were professedly believers, and 2,600,000 who were professedly members of the churches, which held to their basis. And why did those people feel such a deep interest? Because they believed that they had come there to meet the armies of Israel from all parts of the earth, under the banner of their great King—to take part in a movement which had for its object the evangelisation of the world; that they were going to be present, as it were, at a great coronation; and that they were about to erect a great invisible throne, on which their long expected Sovereign would take his seat, according to his promises." I wish you to mark the concession made by this speaker, that there are 2,600,000 persons in the United States connected with evangelical churches. Now, if they truly constitute the church of Christ, there is one question I desire to ask, and that is, how it happens that there are 3,000,000 of people in chains to-day in the United States? (Cheers.) Is it because that great number of professing Christians are shaking hands with slaveholders? Yes. Is it because they are attempting to crush the anti-slavery movement in America? Yes. Is it because they are, in many instances, slaveholders and slave-buyers? Yes, that is the reason. (Cheers.) They may call themselves by whatever name they please; but, as long as they are convicted of being on the side of the oppressor, they are also convicted of being found fighting against God. (Cheers.) Again, one of the delegates from your country said: "Sir, there is hope for our miserable world. The enemies of God and man, in both worlds, are trembling for the results of what we are doing this day. Popery knows it in the Vatican, and quakes in the Vatican, at our proceedings. So Paganism, Mahometanism, and every error in the world, will be more or less affected by what we have to-day been doing." I wonder whether the American slaveholders or their apologists, will care anything about it. (Hear.) I do not believe the Pope of Rome will. The late Pope

put forth his bull, calling on the faithful to clear their hands of blood-guiltiness in regard to slavery and the slave-trade. (Cheers.) I go for that Popery which takes the chains off human limbs. I go against that Protestantism which puts them on. (Cheers.) The Rev. T. R. Birks, rector of Kelshall, Oxfordshire, said: "It was quite true that their Alliance had not the formality of representation; but it had the effect of representation on a scale never enjoyed before, since the days of Christianity. From every branch of the church voices were heard—voices from the banks of the Thames, from the banks of the Rhine, the Danube, the Mississipi, and the St. Lawrence; voices from Africa and from Asia, were all heard, speaking in the sweetest unity on the leading principles of Christianity; and again and again, as they deliberated, had they shown the spirit of the hymn,—

'Ten thousand thousand are their tongues,
But all their hearts are one.'"

Now, their actions on the subject of slavery will show that neither their hearts nor their voices could unite, on the commonest principles of honesty and humanity! They said, We will not bear our testimony against slavery; for, if we attempt to do any thing that means anything, we shall all be blown "sky high," and there will be nothing left of us. (Laughter and cheers.) Quite prematurely, one of the delegates exclaimed, "Was it nothing to exhibit the church as a peaceful constellation, instead of scattering around her fatal firebrands? They had vainly attempted to effect that purpose hitherto, because their practice and their preaching had been so much at variance; they were one intellectually, one on all vital matters, and absolutely one in heart and sympathy; and they should be able to tear to tatters the bulwark of Popery—of Rome's uniformity—by exhibiting a great living reality, that, in all essential doctrine, they were harmonious, and, in all experimental religion, identical. Was all that nothing? and was it nothing to have taken up a position so palpably conspicuous, which propounded that the convictions of Protestant Christendom were against slavery to the core; that, whilst they were willing to fraternise with the godly of every creed, they were willing to fraternise with the godly of every colour; that, whilst they repudiated dishonesty of every sort, they branded with especial contempt those engaged in the theft, the robbery, the usurpation, the sacrilege, the enormity of the slave-trade; who, forgetting that man was moulded in the image of his Creator, would buy and sell and brutalise men; forgetting that every man bore the image of that Maker, whether his skin was white or black, whether his birth be in barbarous Africa or enlightened Europe. Was there nothing in all that? As well might they say, that there was nothing in truth, in mercy, or in justice." Now, here it is claimed for that body, that they took strong and definite action on the subject of slavery. The applause of the world it claimed for that action on the part of the Evangelical Alliance. How, then, was the slavery question treated by the Alliance? On attempting to settle the basis of union, the Rev. John Howard Hinton moved that slaveholders should not be admitted to any Alliance that might be formed. (Cheers.) It was a noble and a Christian motion; and I stand here to lament that it did not finally prevail. Had it done so, the Evangelical Alliance, instead of being a subject of scorn and reprobation to all good men and to angels, would have presented a glorious spectacle to the world—would have given some evidence that it was indeed united to Him who came to open the prison doors, and to set the captive free. (Cheers.) It was, however, carried, but only to be rescinded at last! It was a difficult, intricate, and doubtful question! It was about robbing three millions of men of all their rights; about those who could not have the Bible, their family relations respected, their claims as human beings acknowledged, to whom the Gospel could not be preached, who could not be taught the letters of the alphabet, without its being treated as a criminal act! It was with regard to the three millions of people in a professedly republican and Christian land, who were in a more wretched and horrible condition, by far, than any three millions of men to be found on the face of the earth. Surely one would have thought that the moment the subject was presented, animated by the spirit of Christ, they would have cried out against the enormity, nor have required a moment to record their verdict against it. But they appointed a large Committee of their profoundest minds to take this question into deliberate consideration, and, day after day, almost night after night, they debated the question; but, somehow or other, they could not understand what slavery was, or how it was to be treated! It was, therefore, deemed essential that they should be enlightened from above, and that solemn prayers should be made for them continually, that they might arrive at some conclusion on the matter. I do maintain that they needed no additional light from heaven,—that all this praying was a mockery before God. (Faint hisses, followed by loud cheers.) I believe if the members of this Alliance had only fulfilled a plain Christian duty, and had remembered those who are in bonds as bound with them, they would have had no need to ask direction of God as to what they were to do. I rest the case here—were they not solemnly bound to be in that state of mind in which there could be no cause for delay in coming to a conclusion, that all slave-holding ought instantly to cease, and every slave at once set free? Their condemnation is just. But of all the delegates who are left without excuse, in regard to the matter of asking direction of God, I affirm that these were the American delegates, because, as Americans, they hold it "a self-evident truth, that God has made all men free and equal." (Cheers.) Yet there they were, day after day, professing they did not understand the question—that they had no light from heaven—God had not revealed his will unto them! I say, it was downright blasphemy. Now, I will read you the result, and you will see how the mountain in labour produced a mouse. Dr. F. A. Cox presented the following Report, which was read by Rev. Dr. S. H. Cox:—"In respect to the necessity of personal holiness, the Alliance are of opinion that it is recognised in the article of the basis—on the work of the Spirit; and in reference to various social evils existing in countries within the circle of this Alliance, such as the profanation of the Lord's-day, intemperance, duelling, and the sin of slavery, they commend these and similar evils to the consideration of the branches; trusting that they will study to promote the general purity and the Christian honour of this confederation by all proper means. And in respect especially to the system of slavery, and every other form of oppression in any country, the Alliance are unanimous in deploring them, as in many ways obstructing the progress of the Gospel; and express their confidence, that no branch will admit to membership slaveholders, who, by their own fault, continue in that position, retaining their fellow-men in slavery, from regard to their own interests." I must pause to make a passing remark. I feel my indignation enkindled, when I see what is called the profanation of the Lord's-day, put into the same category with duelling, slavery, and intemperance. There have been multi-

tudes of great and good men, who have considered that every day of the week was to be set apart to the Lord, and, therefore, they have not considered that one day especially should be appropriated for that purpose. The Sabbath they have declared was a Jewish institution. Among these were Luther, Calvin, Tyndale, Paley, Belsham, Penn, Barclay, and Whateley. In this opinion, I entirely coincide. I desire to consecrate my entire life to God, and to regard all time as equally valuable and sacred. Now, to associate men animated by this spirit, and entertaining those views, with drunkards, duellists, and man-stealers, is a great outrage. (Cheers.) But all slaveholders are not involved in the guilt of slavery. Indeed—why, only say that a man may be a slaveholder, and yet be an innocent man, and that is all the concession the slaveholder requires. Yet such a proposition was passed by Englishmen—by English delegates in an Evangelical Alliance! The time had not come for them to take the part of the enslaved of mankind. But even this did not please the Americans. The whole subject was recommitted, and again, for a long time, a great many prayers were put up in behalf of the Committee to whom it was referred. Another Report was then presented, which recommended that that part of the basis of union which related to slavery should be taken out, and passed incidentally as a resolution, so that slaveholders should not be excluded from membership in the Alliance. (Hear, hear.) But that did not suit the American delegates. They were determined that nothing should be said on the subject of slavery; and then there was another recommittal of the delicate question, and we have another Report to this effect, that everything should be rescinded, and that nothing should appear on the proceedings of the Alliance in reference to slavery. (Hear, hear.) This was the concession made to those minions of slavery—the American delegates, who are, on this side of the Atlantic, endeavouring to corrupt the minds of the people of England. I stand here to take off their masks and pronounce them wolves in sheep's clothing before the whole world. (Cheers.) I wish I had time to go through the entire subject; but I will not read the documents that I had prepared. I have thus endeavoured to show you the high claims put forth by the Alliance, to the confidence and love of the friends of God and humanity throughout the world. I have shown you that it professes to be animated by the Spirit of God, to have been of no human devising, to have been baptised deeply into the spirit of our common Lord. I have judged that body by its own standard, not by mine; then I have brought up a simple test, by which to prove it either a Christian or an unchristian body; and if the evidence I have laid before you, on the subject of slavery, proves it to be an unchristian body, the fault is not mine, but theirs who made it an unchristian body; and, therefore, the guilt and responsibility are on their heads. (Cheers.) I am a firm believer in Christianity—in the Christianity taught by Jesus Christ. I am an abolitionist, because I believe Jesus to have been one, because I know that his Gospel is an anti-slavery Gospel, because that into the church of Christ comes no slaveholder—there never was, and there never will be one. (Cheers.) I stand here to denounce these men, who claim to be sent of God, in America, many of whom are among you, who are perverting the Bible to make out a case of innocent slave-holding, so that the whole slave system may be protected through all time. Slave-holding, under all circumstances, they say, is not a sin against God; under some circumstances they say it is a right—it is a duty. I should like to know what a dolphin is, under all circumstances, except it be a dolphin? Or is it sometimes "very like a whale?" (Laughter and cheers.) I should like to know what man-stealing is, under all circumstances, if it be not man-stealing? Slaveholding is a crime well defined. (Cheers.) It is not setting a man free, it is holding him in bondage; it is not recognising him as a brother man, but as a piece of property; it is not holding him in bonds for his good; it is not denouncing every form of oppression for the benefit of mankind, and the glory of God. No, no; it is just the reverse of all this. Hence it is the duty of every man to advocate the cause of liberty. If he wants to make the world believe that the Bible is the book of God, let him be careful how he makes out that slavery is a Bible institution. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I feel sick at heart in regard to the state of things in this country. I did hope something from the Evangelical Alliance. I hoped that they would not consult union at the expense of truth; that the English delegates would be true; that they would bear their testimony against slavery; that they never would recognise the slaveholder as a Christian—a worthy brother in the Lord. As for the American delegates, if there are any here, I should be glad to see them come forward and defend themselves. (Cheers.) We find it very difficult to catch them at anti-slavery meetings in America They are too conscious of their guilt to come. (Hear, hear.)

"'Tis conscience that makes cowards of them all."

I conclude with saying, that if any one can prove that I have said anything derogatory to the glory of God, to the honour of Christ, to the welfare of man, let him take the platform and expose me; but if I have been defending the character of God, and showing that Christ goes for instantaneous and universal emancipation, I do not know why he should take the platform to condemn me. I have done. As to the clergy in America who uphold or apologise slavery, and such as give them the right of fellowship in England, I have only to apply to them the burning rebuke expressed in the following lines by a distinguished American poet:—

"Just God! and these are they
Who minister at thine altar, God of right!
Men who their hands, with prayer and blessing, lay
On Israel's ark of light.

"What! preach and kidnap men!
Give thanks, and rob thy own afflicted poor!
Talk of thy glorious liberty, and then
Bolt hard the captive's door!

"What! servants of thy own
Merciful Son, who came to seek and save
The homeless and the outcast, fettering down
The tasked and plundered slave!

"Woe to the priesthood!—woe
To those whose hire is with the price of blood;
Perverting, darkening, changing, as they go
The searching truths of God!

"Their glory and their might
Shall perish, and their very name shall be
Vile before all the people, in the light
Of a world's liberty!"

(Cheers.)

The Chairman stated, that if any one was desirous of addressing the meeting, an opportunity would now be afforded; but, of course, in order that they might be heard, it was desirable that they should come upon the platform.

Mr. Garrison again rose and said:—I have spoken of the Alliance as a body, not of individual members. Though "all are not Israel that are of Israel," yet there were a few faithful Abdiels in that body. I may mention the Rev. Mr. Nelson and Mr. Stansfield, a lay delegate, both from Belfast, and Rev. Mr. King, also an Irish delegate. With regard to my own countrymen, there was at least one man who nobly did his duty—I allude to Joshua Himes. I will tell you the secret of his fidelity. He is one who is not ashamed to be known as a Garrisonian Abolitionist. (Cheers.)

Rev. J. Preston, Baptist minister of Somers-town, rose to address the assembly in reply to Mr. Garrison: I am, he said, a member of the Evangelical Alliance, call it by what name you please. I attended its nineteen sessions. Perhaps you will hear with patience, when I remind the assembly, that on the subject of slavery I was certainly opposed to what transpired in the Alliance, and finally closed that business. (Cheers.) We had not a smooth path nor a silent meeting on the occasion. In some parts of Mr. Garrison's speech I more than doubted whether he was the friend of Christianity; but he says that he is. I came here expecting that the conduct of the Alliance would be condemned on the subject of slavery, but I did not expect that I should hear Christianity in general undermined. I did not expect to hear prayer to God ridiculed. (Cries of "No, no; you misunderstood it," and great confusion.) The results of the conference of the Evangelical Alliance with regard to slavery are entirely owing to the American brethren. If I am not mistaken, the British members of the Alliance were entirely opposed to slavery. When the Report came up on the Saturday night which entirely excluded slaveholders from the Alliance, we thought the question was settled. But there was afterwards a general dissatisfaction. The Americans were dissatisfied because the resolution condemned slavery and slaveholding; and the British because it condemned them so slightly. (Cheers.) I was astonished at the subsequent results, but so the Americans would have it. (A voice, "Why did you let them have it?") I am sorry to say the Alliance were overpowered. When the question was mooted as to whether the resolution of Saturday could be rescinded, the Chairman replied that it could, but if the Alliance did it they would stultify themselves. I inquired of one of the principal members of the Alliance—not being a learned man—what was meant by stultifying ourselves? I understood it to mean, making fools of ourselves. (Laughter and cheers.) I assure you the greater part of the assembly were stultified; for they knew not what they were, nor where they were. (Laughter.) Great reproach has been cast on the members of the Alliance, and many statements made that are not true. They did not say that they were inspired by the Spirit of God; and it is not true that they sanctioned slaveholders being members of the Alliance. One of the heroes—the leader of the American ranks—just as he was leaving the Conference, found out, to his astonishment, that, after all, he had not gained a complete victory; that slaveholders could not be admitted to the Alliance. We have divided the world into districts. America is one district, Great Britain another, France a third. (Laughter.) The Continent is to be divided into two or three, and so on; and, before a slaveholder can be admitted into the Alliance, the whole of the districts must be consulted and give their sanction. When the œcumenical Alliance meets again—I do not tell you when it will be—(laughter)—if a slaveholder gets in he will be cast out. (Cheers.) We had many prayers in the Alliance, but not too many; for I believe in prayer. (Cheers.) I there stated that I had heard many prayers offered up, but no distinct prayer for 3,000,000 of slaves; but the next brother led our minds to God, especially in reference to that subject. They were many in that assembly whose hearts and voices ascended to heaven, that every chain might be broken, and the oppressed go free. (Cheers.)

George Thompson, Esq., then rose amidst loud applause, on the subsidence of which he said: Sir, I deeply feel the solemnity, importance, and responsibility which attach to the proceedings of this meeting, and, therefore, fervently hope and earnestly pray, that our deliberations may be conducted with calmness with the utmost sobriety of feeling, and with the strictest impartiality of judgment. We have a grave duty to perform—a duty requiring wisdom to direct us, blended with an uncompromising adherence to principle. On this occasion, above all others, we must be no respectors of persons. (Hear, hear.) We must fling aside personal partialities and personal aversions; we must be no sectarians, or party men of any sort; we must not be led away by names, or by numbers, or by titles, or professions, or purposes. Our duty to-night is to canvass, in the spirit of truth and justice, the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of slavery. That Alliance is to night upon its trial, and you are the jury called upon to give the verdict. Let it be an honest one. Let three millions of slaves stand before you, while you consider it. See, stamped upon the soul of every one of them, the image of your God. Be not ashamed to call them brethren; for they are men for whom Christ died, and they shall all stand before the judgment-seat at which we ourselves must appear. Let your verdict be such as you will not regret to have recorded in that book which shall be opened at the last day, in the presence of men and angels. The question is, did the Evangelical Alliance recently assembled in this City, do its duty on the subject of slavery? If it did, commend it, and give your sanction to its proceedings. If it did not, determine what its short comings, its omissions, and its compromises were, and fear not to condemn them. Let the rights of humanity and the law of the living God be maintained, though a hundred Evangelical Alliances should have to be condemned, and held up to the scorn and warning of the world. (Cheers.) I will say a word or two respecting the speech of the reverend gentleman who has just retired. That speech, you will, I think, all admit, answered itself. In the beginning it condemned the harshness of my friend, Mr. Garrison, and was intended to be a defence of the Alliance; but what was it towards the conclusion? An admission that the Alliance had been drawn into a degrading compromise by the American brethren, "if brethren they could be called." (Cheers.) The gentleman himself confessed that he was struck with the singularity of the fact, that, in the midst of all the prayers that were offered while the Committee of "forty-five" was sitting, there was no mention of the three millions of slaves, to whom the subject exclusively related; and that he felt it his duty to suggest, that it might not be wholly irrelevant to the matter in question, if those slaves were remembered at the throne of the heavenly grace. Oh, what a state of things does this simple fact reveal! Slavery the subject, but the slave forgotten. Would Christ have forgotten the slave? Where would his heart have been? In the Committee-room with Sidney Morse, the scurrilous editor of the *New York Observer*, and with Dr. Smyth, the slaveholding Divine from Charleston, or with the bleeding sun-blistered slave, amidst the rice swamps of Carolina? (Loud cheers.) My beloved friend, William Lloyd

Garrison, has been charged with ridiculing prayer, and seeking to undermine Christianity. He did neither the one nor the other. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He denounced a counterfeit Christianity, which forgets the slave in its prayers, which fellowships the slaveholder, which talks of love and has no pity; and he preached a Christianity which opens the prison doors, which binds up the broken heart, which breaks every yoke, and sees a brother and a man in the meanest and most afflicted wretch that was ever left to perish by the way, while the priest and the Levite passed by on the other side. (Cheers.) His ridicule of prayer was not the ridicule of the prayer of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner," or of the soul, agonizing for those in bonds as bound with them; but that prayer which asks God to direct men how they may escape from the consequences of their own abandonment of righteousness, without repentance, and the doing of works meet for repentance. I will remind the friend who brought this charge, that a greater than William Lloyd Garrison once said, "Woe unto you, Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and neglect the weightier matters of the law, —judgment, justice, and faith. Ye bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and will not touch them with one of your fingers. Ye devour widows' houses, and, for a pretence, make long prayers." (Loud cheers.) What was the question that puzzled the Alliance, and for the solution of which they so often asked Divine direction? It was this—Whether they should sanction the vilest and most polluted system of slavery and soul-murder ever invented, by allowing a man engaged in it to be a member of their body? That was the question. Did they need a voice from heaven to decide this? Did they require a messenger from the throne of Jehovah to reveal to them the Divine will on this subject? They had Moses and the prophets. "Whoso stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand he he shall surely be put to death. (Cheers.) If any man be found stealing any of his brethren, then that thief shall die. Ye shall put away evil from among you." (Cheers.) Did they want light? God had told them how to get it. "Cry aloud, spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins. Loose the bands of wickedness; undo the heavy burdens; let the oppressed go free; break every yoke; bring the poor that are cast out into the house. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning: then shalt thou call and the Lord shall answer. If thou satisfy the afflicted soul, thy light shall rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noonday." (Loud cheers.) No wonder they groped in darkness while the three millions of slaves were forgotten. Sir, I have referred to the various Psalms and chapters which were read, and though they seem to have been selected with a special view to the feelings of the American delegates, yet, I think I could show that every one of them clearly pointed the way out of all their difficulties, if their desire had been to do the will of God without reference to the pro-slavery tendencies of some of their members. I must say, it was a spectacle to excite the mingled wonder and pity of the world, to see a thousand men, calling themselves Christians, and, *par excellence*, an Evangelical Alliance, plunged into perplexity and Egyptian darkness by a proposition to exclude man-stealers from their communion. Verily these spiritual regenerators of the world need that some one should teach them what Christianity is, and what that meaneth —"I will have mercy and not sacrifice; to obey is better than to sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Oh, Sir, these men missed a glorious opportunity of bearing a testimony for the Great Redeemer, against the practical atheism of the nineteenth century. As it was, I shall proceed to prove, that they fell lamentably short of their duty as Christians, and did far less than an assembly of men, making no profession of religion, would have done. (Hear.) Let me state the motive which has led to the holding of this meeting, For a considerable time it has been my deep and growing conviction, that the intercourse between the churches of this country and those of the United States had a tendency to lower and corrupt the anti-slavery sentiment of this country. Without an exception, all the delegates from religious denominations here to the United States have fallen short of their duty —they have, more or less, proved recreant to the cause of the slave. They have loved popularity and union better than principle. I know it would have been impossible for them to mingle with their fellow-Christians there unless they had done so. Every man must give up his anti-slavery principles who goes to America, unless he would have his name cast out as evil. The last of these delegations was from the *Free*, protesting, anti-Erastian Church of Scotland. What was the conduct of that delegation? The members of it went into the slave states, where they beheld all the bloody and diabolical symbols of a traffic in slaves and the souls of men. They saw three millions of their brethren in bondage, the bitterest for the body, and the most debasing for the soul, the world has ever seen. They stood in the midst of a wide-spread scene of concubinage, lust, cruelty, incest, robbery, and murder. They saw the church consenting to all this—practising all this. They saw elders, deacons, ministers, and moderators, greedily participating the gains of this infernal system, and they fraternized with the man thief—they were his guests—they took him to their bosom—they preached in his pulpit—they sat down with him at the communion—they received into their hands a share of that which he had stolen from the slave—and they did all this with a perfect knowledge that, in return, they were to be profoundly silent respecting the sin of slavery, and were to receive the man-stealer into fellowship with the Free Church of Scotland. They travelled from the banks of the Potomac to the banks of the Sabine, and from the shores washed by the Atlantic to the settlements reposing under the shade of the Rocky Mountains, and they uttered not a syllable of condemnation of the system. They came home. The money of the slaveholder was received, and the slaveholder's Christianity was acknowledged. The Free Church was thrown upon its defence; and now the leaders of that church are defending slavery from the Bible, and are amongst the most furious and virulent calumniators of all faithful abolitionists. So are their organs. Witness the *Scottish Guardian*, the *Free Church Magazine*, the *Dundee Warder*, and the *Edinburgh Witness*. (Loud cries of "Shame!") Let me put it to Mr. Preston, who the parties are that undermine Christianity? Is it I, who go to it to plead for the slave, or those who go to it to justify the man who is a slaveholder? (Cheers.) Why, Sir, without Christianity, every man, when he makes the case his own, pronounces slavery a sin and a curse. The language of nature is, "Let it be accursed." (Cheers.) We need not Christianity to teach us that man-stealing is the commission of all crimes in one, though we need the sanctions of Christianity and the motives which it inspires to lead us to abandon the crime. (Cheers.) Try the horrible system by its effects, both upon the oppressors and their victims, and it is proved at once to be the prolific source of every enormity that man is

capable of perpetrating, and of every calamity and form of suffering that man is capable of enduring. And yet a thousand men, who had made the study of the Bible the business of their lives, could not decide the question, whether the most culpable of all the upholders of slavery—namely, the man making high professions of Christianity—should be a member of their Alliance? Would the slaves want Divine illumination? (Cheers.) There is not a human being in the world that would stand up and say, "I wish to be a slave." (Hear, hear.) All natural justice cries "Let slavery be accursed." Let the system be tried by reason or by revelation, and instead of the Alliance hesitating for a moment, they should, as if with the voice of one man—if the spirit of Christ had been upon them, or his Word dearer to them than union, had they considered the slave as bound with him—have said, "Let slavery be accursed, let no hand touch it, let not the unclean thing pollute the ark of our God." (Loud cheers.) As far as we are concerned, we occupy no fresh ground; let us not, therefore, be branded as new-born fanatics. We go to the larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, and we read there its comment upon these words of St. Paul to Timothy, "The law is made for man-stealers." In 1794, the General Assembly of the United States declared the inadmissibility of any man retaining a fellow-creature in bondage to be regarded as a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. They pronounced him as a man-stealer. Reasoning from past events, we were led to apprehend, when we heard of a large number of delegates coming from the United States, that there would be a compromise of the Anti-slavery principle in the Alliance, and we therefore regarded its proceedings with intense interest. Let me say, in one sentence, what they did, and what they did not. When a Report was made, setting forth in the first paragraph who should hereafter be members of that Alliance, the Rev. J. H. Hinton moved, as an addition, these words,—"except slave-holders." All persons signing the confession of faith to be eligible, in every part of the world, "except slave-holders." (Hear, hear.) The moment the amendment was proposed, the Conference was in a state of division and consternation; the countenances of hundreds fell, and they were not the united and loving creatures they had previously been. (Laughter and cheers.) After a long discussion, it was resolved, that a Committee should be appointed to draft a resolution on the subject. There should have been no hesitation in such a meeting to adopt Mr. Hinton's amendment. Was it reasonable or unreasonable to ask, that he who claimed the right of property in his fellow-man should not belong to that Alliance? (Hear, hear.) The members of that Alliance compromised the Anti-slavery principle, by hesitating to adopt that amendment. (Cheers.) Mr. Preston has said that the British brethren were true;—if so, where was their firmness and their fidelity, then? (Hear, hear.) What is a man's principle worth, if it fails just when it should not? (Cheers.) There was in the Alliance an overwhelming majority of British members; and what shall we say of them, if it be true, as Mr. Preston has represented, that the American delegates led them as easily by the nose as asses? (Laughter and immense cheering.) There was not a British Christian minister in that assembly who did not know the feeling of his own denomination upon the subject. To the honour of the Baptist body, it was one of their number that moved the amendment. (Cheers.) Would that he had not withdrawn it!—would that he had made himself of no reputation by his fidelity, and had been content to be in a minority of two, four, or six, in that assembly! (Cheers.) We should then have been delighted to give him more honour than we now feel at liberty to award. But we do give Mr. Hinton thanks, when he knew not that there was an American delegate that would second him. (Hear, hear.) The amendment was rejected, and a resolution was brought up, which expressed a confident hope, "that the American brethren would not admit the slaveholders," that is, a slaveholder of his own fault. If it is not of his own fault, whose fault is it? (Loud cheers.) The Free-Church Assembly has stated, that the providence of God brought the slaveholder into his present circumstances, and therefore the corollary is, that God is answerable for it. (Hear, hear.)

A Voice: I want to know your authority for that. I want to know whether you are to stand there attacking a body of Christians.

George Thompson, Esq.: I tell you: I sat in the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland on the 30th May last, and heard Dr. Cunningham declare, that Christ and his apostles welcomed slaveholders to the Lord's Supper. I heard Dr. Candlish say, there were many slaveholders who were pre-eminent for their piety, were deserving of the full recognition of that church, and that they had been brought into their unhappy position by the providence of God. (Immense cheers.) I had their words printed on large placards, and posted about the streets of Edinburgh. (Cheers.) I will tell that gentleman, that these doctrines were received with cheers by the reverend assembly—(cries of "Shame")—and that there was but one man that rose to take an exception to them, and he could not find a seconder for his amendment!

A Voice: Is this an anti-slavery or an anti-clerical meeting?

George Thompson, Esq.: It is purely, without mixture, without reservation, an anti-slavery meeting, and I am truly sorry that an anti-slavery meeting in England should, of necessity, be an anti-clerical meeting. We are not answerable for this. (Long-continued cheers.) We naturally, I say, felt great interest in the proceedings of the Alliance, and as naturally felt great disgust with their resolution—"No man who is a slaveholder of his own fault or for his own interest." I do not know such a man. (Cheers.) There are three men on this platform who were once slaves in the United States,—would that the hall were full of them. (Loud cheers.) I ask one of them, the self-emancipated slave, Frederick Douglass, if he ever knew a man in the Southern States of America who was not a slaveholder of his own fault? (Hear, hear.) Is this the doctrine of the Evangelical Alliance—that a man may innocently claim another man as his own? I speak not now of the treatment of the slave; he may make his fetters of fine gold if he will, yet by keeping him in bondage he gives his sanction to the system. (Cheers.) Will you sanction in Exeter-hall to-night the doctrine, that God has put a man into a position in which he is necessitated to be a slaveholder? (Cries of "No.") They say, He is a pious man, an elder, or a D.D., or the principal of some college, or, peradventure, he is a bishop; and they ask, "can you doubt the Christianity of that man, who has proved his piety and zeal, his liberality and anxiety, for the salvation of the world? Can you shut such a man out of the Christian communion for the little fault of being a slaveholder?" (Cheers.) Sir, the monster in New Orleans, driving his gang to the sugar-field, starving them, mutilating them, and destroying them, does not (nor a thousand such men) do a tithe of the mischief to the cause of freedom that those do that are called holy and otherwise blameless men? They are the men of all others to be disciplined; they are within reach; they claim to be Christian men; they are within the

pale of our denominations, and within the cognizance of our laws; they are amenable and should be dealt with as the worst defenders of slavery. I turn from the wretch sunk in ignorance, led by his own passions, influenced by love of gain, with comparative patience, to the doctor of divinity who presents himself at the door of the Alliance, as Dr. Smyth, of Charlestown, did, with the blood of his fellow man on his hands. (Cheers.) The Alliance has set an example without precedent, that of legislating for an exception, instead of leaving the exception to take care of itself. (Cheers.) The truth is, the members of that Alliance preferred a union with Drs. Cox, and Smith, and Emory and Olin, to the maintenance of principle. Evil communications corrupt good manners. Elsewhere they would have scouted such a resolution as that which they adopted. But after all they did not gain their object. The Cerberus rejected the sop. The Americans took Sunday to consider, and resolved, on Monday, that they would rescind the resolution; and they did so, although that resolution was to go among the "miscellaneous" proceedings of the Alliance; and now, though slavery was the topic of topics in the Alliance, and though there was Committee upon Committee on the subject, and prayer upon prayer in relation to it, not one word will appear upon the proceedings of the Alliance, to tell the world that there is such a thing as slavery, still less to tell the world that the Alliance condemns it, and repudiates all fellowship with the man-stealer. (Cheers.) Look at the position into which the members of the Alliance have forced themselves. Henceforth they must vindicate their conduct. Should they stand up, as many of them have done in times past, to denounce slavery, they will be told of their doings in the Alliance, and forthwith they will proceed to justify their doings; and, like the leaders of the Free Church, every step they take will lead them further and further from principle; unless, indeed, they should make a frank confession of error, and declare their determination never again to talk of men holding slaves without being in fault. Sir, let me assure this audience, that the apologies made for slaveholders by such men as are now in this country, are wholly gratuitous and unauthorised, — and they know it. They know as well as I do that the absolute right of property in man is openly avowed and maintained by the ecclesiastical assemblies of the South. I tell those men from this platform, that the churches they belong to in the United States, as far as they are in the south, laugh to scorn such nonsense as was put into the resolution of the Alliance. Suffer me, for a few moments, to draw your attention to two or three extracts from the documents of those slaveholders which the Alliance, in its expansive charity, wish the world to suppose are in their present unhappy position from no fault of their own. (Cheers.) First, let me ask you to look at the mental, moral, and spiritual condition of the slave population, as described by the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia some years ago. "Who would credit it, that in these years of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian republic, there are over 2,000,000 of human beings in the condition of heathen, and, in some respects, in a worse condition. From long-continued and close observation, we believe that their moral and religious condition is such that they may justly be considered the heathen of this Christian country, and will bear comparison with heathen in any country in the world. The negroes are destitute of the Gospel, and ever will be, under the present state of things. In the vast field extending from an entire state beyond the Potomac to the Sabine river, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not twelve men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes. In the present state of feeling in the south, a ministry of their own colour could neither be obtained nor tolerated." Does this soul-sickening picture prove that the slaves have been held for their own good? Does it not prove that they have been treated as though they had no souls? And that, while their masters have been sending Bibles and missionaries to the ends of the earth, they have kept their slaves at home in the condition of brutes. Do you ask, to what extent this system is participated in by the professed Christians of America? Hear the answer, from the pen of the stated clerk of a presbytery in the state of Mississippi:—"If slavery be a sin, and if advertising and apprehending slaves with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the Divine law, and if the buying, selling, and holding a slave for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal, then verily, three-fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven states of the Union, are of the devil. They hold, if they do not buy and sell slaves; and, with few exceptions, they hesitate not to apprehend and restore runaway slaves when in their power." (Shame!) Do you ask, what the opinions of the Presbyterian clergy are? take the following specimens. The clergy of Richmond, Virginia, on the 29th of August, 1835,—"Resolved, that the suspicions that have prevailed to a considerable extent against ministers of the Gospel, and professors of religion in the state of Virginia, as identified with abolitionists, are wholly unmerited, believing as we do, from extensive acquaintance with our churches and brethren, that they are unanimous in opposing the pernicious schemes of abolitionists." The synod of Virginia subsequently passed the following resolution:—"Resolved unanimously, that we consider the dogma fiercely promulgated by said associations—that slavery, as it actually exists in our slaveholding states, is necessarily sinful, and ought to by immediately abolished, and the conclusions which naturally follow from that dogma,—as directly and palpably contrary to the plainest principles of common sense and common humanity, and to the clearest authority of the Word of God." The Charleston, South Carolina, Union Presbytery, unequivocally avow their opinion as follows:—"Resolved, that in the opinion of this Presbytery, the holding of slaves, so far from being a sin in the sight of God, is nowhere condemned in his holy Word: that it is in accordance with the example or consistent with the precepts of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles; that it is compatible with the most fraternal regard to the best good of those servants whom God may have committed to our charge; and that, therefore, they who assume the contrary position, and lay it down as a fundamental principle in morals and religion, that slavery is wrong, proceed upon false principles!" Do not these official documents prove that the right of property in man is distinctly claimed by these churches? I tell you again, that Dr. Cox dare not take the resolution passed by the Alliance and defend it in any of the southern States. He knows, if the assumed right to hold property in man be a sin, that the churches of the south are of the devil. (Hear, hear.) Let me now give you a specimen of a southern bishop, premising that this same bishop sent a letter to the Evangelical Alliance, which was read by Dr. Bunting—a letter vouching, no doubt, for the piety of the slaveholders of the south. The extracts I am about to read are from a volume of familiar sermons written by this godly prelate, to be read by slave-masters and mistresses to their property. (Hear, hear.) Listen, and, if you can, restrain your indigna-

tion. You must imagine the slaves assembled, the hymn sung, the chapter read (the Epistle of Paul to Philemon), the prayer offered, and the sermon commenced. Here is a paragraph:—"Having thus shown you the chief duties you owe to your great Master in heaven, I now come to lay before you the duties you owe to your masters and mistresses here upon earth. And for this you have one general rule that you ought always to carry in your minds, and that is, to do all service for them as if you did it for God himself. Poor creatures! you little consider when you are idle and neglectful of your masters' business, when you steal and waste and hurt any of their substance, when you are saucy and impudent, when you are telling them lies and deceiving them, or when you prove stubborn and sullen, and will not do the work you are set about without stripes and vexation—you do not consider, I say, that what faults you are guilty of towards your masters and mistresses, are faults done against God himself, who hath set your masters and mistresses over you in his own stead—(horrible!)—and expects that you will do for them just as you would do for him. And pray do not think that I want to deceive you, when I tell you that your masters and mistresses are God's overseers!" (Shame!) Let us turn to another part of this precious piece of hypocrisy and blasphemy. (Cheers.) "Christian ministers are commanded to 'exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things, not answering them again, or gainsaying.' You see how strictly God requires this of you, that whatever your masters and mistresses order you to do, you must set about it immediately and faithfully perform it, without any disputing or grumbling, and take care to please them well in all things. And, for your encouragement, he tells you that he will reward you for it in heaven—(horrible!)—because, while you are honestly and faithfully doing your master's business here, you are serving your Lord and Master in heaven. You see, also, that you are not to take any exceptions to the behaviour of your masters and mistresses, and that you are to be subject and obedient, not only to such as are good and gentle and mild towards you, but also to such as may be froward, peevish, and hard. For you are not at liberty to choose your own masters; but into whatever hands God hath been pleased to put you, you must do your duty, and God will reward you for it." (Shame!) The climax is yet to come. Under the head of "Correction," the bishop preaches as follows:—"Now, when correction is given you, you either deserve it, or you do not deserve it. But whether you really deserve it or not, it is your duty, and Almighty God requires that you bear it patiently. (Shame!) You may, perhaps, think that this is hard doctrine, but, if you consider it right, you must needs think otherwise of it. Suppose, then, that you deserve correction, you cannot but say that it is just and right you should meet with it. Suppose you do not, or at least you do not deserve so much, or so severe a correction for the fault you have committed,—you perhaps have escaped a great many more, and are at last paid for all. (Horrible!) Or, suppose you are quite innocent of what is laid to your charge, and suffer wrongfully in that particular thing,—is it not possible you may have done some other bad thing which was never discovered, and that Almighty God who saw you doing it would not let you escape without punishment?" (The audience manifested the strongest indignation during the reading of these passages.) What think you (continued Mr. Thompson) of such religion as this? Is it from above or from beneath? Yet a letter from this preacher of the doctrine of devils is written to the Alliance, is received with all respect, and is allowed to influence the councils of that body! (Shame!) Oh, that the slaves whose souls are cheated by these lying priests, knew their power! Oh, that they could reckon their number, and awake to a sense of their manhood! I cannot utter the deep execrations of my soul against the conduct of the American slaveholders, and especially of the so-called religious among them. Cowards are they all—mean, dastardly cowards, who take advantage of the ignorance and impotence of three millions of God's family to make them slaves; and then the impious wretches pollute, pervert, and prostitute the Gospel of Christ to delude the souls of their victims! (Cheers.) Their guilt is only equalled by their detestable meanness. I know full well, that we who are here are represented as fanatics, and that the Coxes and Kirks are very anxious to throw odium upon Garrison and Thompson. Now, Sir, there was a time when these gentlemen thought otherwise; but they have since repented of their early zeal, and now we find them floating, like dead matter, in the wake of the pro-slavery sentiments of their country. Verily, they have their reward. One of them is popular at Boston, and could, doubtless, go to the south without being Lynched, and the other has been promoted to the Moderator's chair of the New School General Assembly, where he received the thanks of slaveholders for his conduct. Now, I will take the liberty of showing what the sentiments of Dr. Cox were some years ago, when I was myself in the United States. He was then a new convert, and in the spring-time of his abolitionism he wrote a letter to the Rev. Dr. Morison, of Chelsea, in which he discussed the subject of slavery. Hear what he says. His letter is dated, New York, April, 1835. "We wish the whole world to know more of the subject; that both sides of the colonisation question may be heard; that both sides of the Anti-Slavery question may be heard; that a world of wicked calumny against the latter institution may be exterminated; that the truth of cis-atlantic matters in the cause of emancipation may be known by its trans-atlantic correspondents and friends; that these may have an authentic manual of facts and expositions and references, for appropriate use on all requisite occasions; that the sympathies and prayers of British Europe may be directed wisely and engaged steadily in behalf of the suffering and the dumb; that the attention of thousands may be held in during arrest, on the mighty subject of the interests and the right, and the duties of man, in their due conjunction and dependence; that the mother-country may be encouraged to still further achievements in the cause of universal freedom and the moral elevation of the species, by the evidence afforded, that her noble example is talismanic and electric in its influence on the daughter country, though following in her path too tardily, *haud æquis passibus;* that the growing interest and the glorious promise of their American brethren in the cause may be adequately, or, at least, in some degree, known by British philanthropists; and that these demonstrations may prepare the way for kindred responses, and for affiliated Societies on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere, in the British empire and the European dependencies, till, at no distant day, we may behold the organisation of a grand Philanthropic Union for the abolition of slavery and the Slave-trade throughout the whole world; and these preliminary to the destined reign of the Desire of all nations, and his jurisdiction predominant in all lands and in all hearts of the sublunary universe. If this be enthusiastic, it is so only in a sense sober and good. It is the enthusiasm of the Bible—the enthusiasm of God. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. How can one be good, and not desire it? or wise, and not aim at it? or faithful, and not trust in God for its

accomplishment? Slavery is sin; and this is the fundamental aphorism and axiom of our Anti-Slavery League." Where is he to-night? This is a meeting of the Anti-Slavery League. (Loud cheers.) "We will not descend from the heavenly eminence and infinite vantage-ground of that sure position. What ought to be, can be. This we know, while we hope in God and go forward. The bare conception of such a regenerated state of society is a felicity and a relief. It meliorates the character and comforts the heart. On the other hand, the sentiment that slavery must be perpetual is a most injurious and gloomy one. To entertain it is to be base, miserable, and alienated, one should think, from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart, as those having the understanding darkened and also being past feeling. But we, my brother, have not so learned Christ. The throne of the devil shall not always rule or stand. Man-murdering and man-stealing shall come to an end in these territories of Messiah. But it is impossible that 'His unsuffering kingdom' should effectually come while slavery remains and flourishes. Such a system of glaring iniquity and God-denying oppression cannot co-exist with the extended and triumphant interests of the Gospel." Hear what he says of my friend Mr. Garrison:—"The commencement of such a moral enterprise must be crowded with difficulties, and its agents designated as the forlorn hope of the army. Garrison had the honour of a pioneer in this revival of the abolition controversy; and his rising and prospective fame is already hated with a demon cruelty. (Cheers.) I have heard every epithet of abuse piled on his devoted head, and really dreaded his name before I knew his character. And now what is his villany? Why, he saw through the hoax of colonisationism; and demonstrated it with the stern visage of a martyr, to the scorn of conscience, and the execration of the good. He did this at first alone,—the object of a storm of persecution and a flood of indignation. And what is his fault? Truly, he flatters no one, quails to evidence against authority, takes men more by their actions than their professions, tells the truth—some say—in a most uncourtly style—(laughter and cheers)—and edits a weekly newspaper. He is the friend of man and the foe of oppression. The species are his brothers, and his country is the world. But who wants to be ruled by the Garrison? Indeed, I know not. Can the querist answer me one question? Well, I will give it to him when I find one more impertinent than his own. It is as full of nonsense, inapt, and insolent as the slang about amalgamation. I never saw in Mr. Garrison any efforts to rule. He never ruled me. He seems indignant indeed that truth and evidence are not permitted to rule even the sacramental allies and official friends of both. But says one, 'I hate his style. It is stern, vulgar, uncompromising, severe. He is a mere firebrand.' Oh, then, one would think that Birney would just suit you—the learned, chivalrous, accomplished Birney,—the boast of Kentucky, and the flower of abolition. 'No, no. He is too polished.' Well,—of scores of others,—who has a style to suit you? Surely it must be Jay! or, if not, then it is any dotard that advocates colonisation, as if it were wise; cruelty, as if it were necessary; oppression, as if it were expedient; and prejudice, as if it had neither its subject nor its object. We happen to know what is the matter with such critics. The idea that the Bible sanctions slavery is one to which dreamers often resort, without any proof or sound examination. Let them define what slavery is, with mathematical precision, before they blaspheme the book of the Holy Ghost. In the name of the Most High God, I pronounce it an impious calumny and an atrocious lie, without conceding anything in reference to the whole Bible. I beg all men to consider under what dispensation we live, and whether even they can think slavery sanctioned now? Go, preach the Gospel to each creature of the species—except the man in chains—Stay!—there is no exception! And shall he be oppressed so terribly by you, whom you are endeavouring to rescue from the bondage of the devil? Is this duty? Is it even expediency?" He then goes on to speak of George Thompson—(Laughter)—but I do not like to read it. (Cries of "Read, Go on.") "Your George Thompson is doing good here on a great scale. He is well fitted for his work, invincible in argument, *au fait* on every point, popular and convincing, gains as he goes, and will, I think, be both more persecuted and more successful. He is hated, denounced, threatened by many,—to whose wicked prejudices the diurnal Press is too generally subservient. They charge him with many things, some of which I know to be facts—such as that he is a foreigner, that he is an Englishman, and even that he is a Scotchman! But, calm your ire, Dr. Morison; the last charge is not true, though they say it. Let them learn to say truth only." My friend Mr. Garrison and myself are obliged for these testimonials from one who witnessed our labours, and was himself at the time a sharer of them. But where is Dr. Cox now? Garrison is here, Thompson is here, but where is the eloquent Dr. Cox? (Cheers.) He has made shipwreck of his abolitionism. I have here a file of the *New York Evangelist*, containing a consecutive report of the debates in the General Assembly, in which Dr. Cox presided a few months ago. I find among the members of that Assembly a number of slaveholders. I find more than a dozen speakers in favour of slavery—vindicating the system from the Bible, and breathing the bitterest feelings towards the abolitionists. I find that every attempt to obtain a sound opinion on the subject was a failure; but I do not find a word from Dr. Cox in reprobation of the system. He sat with men-thieves and advocates of slavery, but I cannot find that he bore his testimony against "man-murdering and man-stealing," or against that "system of daring iniquity and god-denying oppression," which he denounced in 1835. He is a fallen man! I have a letter here from one who sat in the Assembly during its sittings. Dr. Cox is represented as saying, that, in his hands, the honour of that Assembly would be safe, while he was in the Alliance; and that, if the character of his brethren was impeached, he would quit the meeting and shake off the dust from his feet. (Cries of "Shame.") I will now hasten to make way for my esteemed and eloquent friend, Frederick Douglass, who, from his own experience, will tell you what slavery is, and what is the worth of the Christianity of slaveholders. Before I sit down let me disclaim, on behalf of myself and others, all quarrel with the Evangelical Alliance, save on the subject of slavery. Let me express a hope, too, that those who have fallen into error will retrace their steps, and be found hereafter among the uncompromising friends of freedom. (Cheers.) They must, however, shake off, as regards the slave question, such men as they have recently kept company with. The scurrilous editor of the *New York Observer*, Mr. Sidney E. Morse, will lead them astray as long as he is permitted to dabble in their councils. For fifteen years, as his paper will prove, he has been the unscrupulous and implacable enemy of the abolitionists of America, recommending his paper to the slave-

holders, by inserting every libel that malice could invent to injure the character of the friends of the slave. Yet this man was in the Alliance, working, like a mole, to corrupt that body, and traduce, the only devoted champions of the oppressed. Dr. Smyth has been forced to apologise for the promulgation of atrocious charges against Frederick Douglass, and got into the Alliance by a barefaced subterfuge. The Coxes and the Kirks are, I admit, better men; but, as they themselves say, they are not prepared to give up the slaveholders. They, therefore, are dangerous men. All who were here, save two or three, joined in misrepresenting both the motives and the measures of the true-hearted advocates of the rights of the slave. There sits a man, however, (Mr. Garrison) who has never swerved. In youth, he laid his hand upon the altar of freedom, and registered a vow in heaven that he would live for the cause of humanity. (Cheers.) For sixteen years his course has been onward and upward. No dangers have daunted—no difficulties have deterred—he has been hunted like a wild beast—he has been dragged with a halter about his neck almost to the foot of the gibbet—a price has been offered for his head—but, in the midst of all, he has serenely, hopefully, and untiringly pursued his course, counting not his life dear to him, if he might promote the cause of his brethren in bonds. (Loud cheers.) What is his reward at the hands of the pro-slavery clergy of his native land? This. They hate him with a perfect hatred. They seek to overwhelm him with every epithet that is likely to stir up ignorance and bigotry against him; and if you were to take his character from those who are now among us, he is an infidel and a seditious and pestilent fellow. But those who sympathise with him, in his uncompromising principles of abolitionism, know that his infidelity is his belief in the duty of acting out the precepts of the Saviour, rather than in contending for points of doctrine. They know that it is the study of his life to imitate him who went about doing good, and who, in his day, was assailed as an infidel and one possessed of the devil. Mr. Garrison (though he omitted to say so) has moved, and it is my purpose to second a series of resolutions in which we have endeavoured to imbody sound views and principles on the subject of slavery. We have also proposed one bearing upon the recent proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, which I do not think you will deem too strong, and which some of us deemed scarcely strong enough. Mr. Thompson then read the resolutions, and concluded as follows:—I now appeal from the Evangelical Alliance to the friends of freedom throughout Great Britian. The cause of the slave must not be committed to the hands of religious associations that have the remotest connexion with the upholders of slavery, or its apologists. Already we have seen the danger of the sacred cause when in the hands even of an Evangelical Alliance. Our motto must be—"no union with slaveholders;" and our doctrine must be—that "slaveholding is, under all circumstances, a crime against the rights of man, and the prerogative of God, that ought to be everywhere denounced, and immediately abandoned by its guilty perpetrators." I will follow the example of my friend Garrison, and conclude in the words of an American poet:—

Spirit of Freedom, on!
Oh! pause not in thy flight,
Till every clime be won
To worship in thy light.

Speed on thy glorious way,
And wake the sleeping lands;
Millions are watching for thy ray,
And spread to thee their hands.

On! till thy name is known
Throughout the peopled earth;
On! till thou reign'st alone,
Man's heritage by birth.

On! till from every vale,
And where the mountains rise,
The beacon-lights of Liberty
Shall kindle to the skies!

(Mr. Thompson sat down amidst enthusiastic cheers.)

The following are the resolutions moved by Mr. Thompson:—

"That, whereas, there are three millions of human beings in slavery in the United States of America, supjected every moment to all the liabilities attaching to every description of property; a condition in which, while as respects rights and privileges, they are ranked with the clods and creeping things of the earth, they are, in respect of the laws framed to enforce their submission, subjected to a responsibility more than human; a condition, the essential element in the preservation of which is the virtual annihilation of their accountableness to God, and the substitution of the absolute will of the master, as the only law they are to obey; a condition, in which the attempt to improve and exercise their deathless faculties, is regarded and treated as a crime; a condition, finally, entailed upon their posterity, to the latest generation:

"Therefore, Resolved,—That we regard American slavery as a sin of unrivalled magnitude, demanding the condemnation of every human being who respects the law of God, or recognises the principle of natural justice and the equal rights of man.

"Whereas it is a self-evident truth that where is sin there must be a sinner; and that when the sinner ceases to exist, the sin of which he was guilty ceases to be; and whereas American slavery is not merely a 'sinful system' or 'institution,' but a series of sinful acts, perpetrated by individuals, each of whom is separately responsible; and whereas, when slavery becomes law, and assumes the form and stability of a social institution, the individual is not in consequence released from his responsibility to obey the law of God, to cease from doing evil; but is, on the contrary, laid under an obligation to bear testimony against the unrighteous enactment.

"Therefore, resolved, That we repudiate the doctrine that slavery, as a system, or institution, or thing existing in the form of law, is sin, while the slaveholder, for whose benefit the law or institution has been framed, and who is directly the perpetrator of the wrong, is innocent, and is entitled to be received into society, and even into the church, as a respectable and Christian man. In our judgment this doctrine involves the monstrous principle, that sin ceases to be sin when sanctioned by human law, and interwoven with the texture of society—a doctrine which would, under similar circumstances, justify polygamy, piracy, idolatry, or any other sin that should obtain the sanction of a legal enactment, or be elevated to the dignity of a social institution.

"Resolved, That the relation of master and slave, when defined and sanctioned by law, is by that very process rendered a more inexcusable sin on the part of all who come into it as slaveholders, seeing they assume the relation, with a full knowledge of its unutterable horrors and fearful responsibilities, and of the perpetual wrongs to the slave necessarily involved in it; and therefore, the slave laws of America, instead of extenuating the guilt of living slaveholders, do, in reality, enhance their criminality, and make them justly chargeable with all the guilt connected with the administration of those laws, which, by the relation they have assumed, they practically sanction and uphold.

"Finally resolved, That the conduct of the Evangelical Alliance recently held in this city, first, in adopting a proposition, declaring that men might be slaveholders without any fault of their own, and from disinterested motives; and then, to gratify the pro-slavery spirit of the American delegates, erasing from their proceedings all reference to the subject of slavery, in order to prevent an explosion,—was at variance with the uncompromising spirit of Christian truth; and a virtual approval of the acts of those, who, while they profess to be the followers of the great Redeemer, make merchandise of slaves and the souls of men."

Mr. Percy St. John then stood forward, and requested to address the assembly. He knew, he said, nothing of the Evangelical Alliance but what he had heard this evening, and out of their own mouths he would condemn the speakers who had appeared before them. (Laughter and great confusion.) He had not only heard the Alliance condemned, but the descendants of the Puritans and the Free Church of Scotland had been placed on a pinnacle of infamy which would fall back on those who had endeavoured to injure it. (Laughter, and cries of "Retire!") They had been told that they were to have as little connexion with America as possible. [Great disapprobation, which made it necessary for the Chairman to interfere and entreat for Percy St. John a patient hearing.] Mr. Percy St. John resumed: There is not one who is more ready to admit the talent, the eloquence, and the honesty of purpose of the gentleman who has just addressed you than I am; he has come to state what he thinks is a fact: but what are the means by which he proposes to abolish slavery? To have as little connexion with the United States as possible, instead of holding out the hand to America and proposing to work with her in her purpose. He stood there the advocate of the slaves in the United States. They would be emancipated, but not by telling the people of the United States that they were not Christians. (Disapprobation.) I simply come here (he said) as an advocate of truth, to say, that half the people of America are not slaveholders—that half are abolitionists; and these men should be received into the bosom of any Evangelical Alliance, whatever you may call them. We are told that the Evangelical Alliance claimed Divine authority. I deny it; it only went on the principle of the Bible, that where two or three were gathered together, there God would be in the midst of them. I oppose the resolutions, and will state the reason why I hold up my hand against them. It is because they are too sweeping; they do not leave a loop-hole which may induce the Americans to come to the noble purpose that we have at heart. (Laughter and cheers.) The speaker then withdrew from the platform, amid the hisses of the assembly.

The Chairman: The gentleman has fallen into some little mistake. They are not resolutions against America, or persons that are not slaveholders or supporters of that system. These resolutions are simply against slaveholders and the supporters of slavery. (Cheers.)

The resolution was then put and carried, with only two dissentients.

Mr. Garrison rose and said, that a paper had been put into his hands, from which he was happy to find, that in the Alliance there were four or five Americans who were true to the Anti-slavery cause. He wished that they had been all true to it. (Applause.)

Frederick Douglass then rose, and was received with reiterated cheers. After a few introductory observations, he said: We have no fear of the ministers of religion from America; but they have thrown themselves across our path, and we have felt it our duty to appear in the cause of the slave. The power of the political parties in the United States sinks into insignificance as compared with the power exercised by the churches of America to uphold that system. It is with such reasoning as you have heard from Bishop Meade that the abolitionists have to contend; and, what is worse, all the religious instruction given to the slaves in the United States, is mingled with such instruction as you have heard from him. (Hear.) The slave holder keeps his captive in ignorance, and then corrupts his religious sentiments to reduce him into deeper slavery. I have heard sermon after sermon preached, to make me satisfied with my position as a slave, and to show that God intended me to occupy that position, and that my hope in time and for eternity depended upon my obedience to my master and mistress. (Hear, hear.) There have been cases where slaveowners have been awakened to their guilt, and they have been lulled to sleep again by the preaching of the pulpit in the Southern states. The fact that three millions of slaves live in a land where there are more than two millions of professing Christians, shows that religion is not what it ought to be. Think you that religion can co-exist with gags, thumbscrews, thongs, blood-hounds, cat-o'-nine tails, branding-irons? (Hear, hear.) Only think of making a boast that you live in a land of liberty where three millions of men are deprived of that blessing—where there are three millions of people denied the right of marriage, not permitted to testify in civil suits against a white man—where there are seventy-one offences dooming a slave to death, for not one of which, if committed by a white man, is he even punishable! (Hear, hear.) Think of these men never speaking a word of sympathy or pity for the poor slave! This should have led the Evangelical Alliance to bar its gateways, to keep out such men as have been among them in the person of Dr. Smyth and others. I happen to know something about one of the members of the Alliance—I allude to Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, South Carolina. That man stands justly charged with performing mock marriages among the slaves, leaving out the most important part of the ceremony,—"What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") When marriages do take place among slaves, these words are left out, for the best of all reasons,—they come to an understanding that the master may have a right to tear asunder the pair whom the minister professes to join together. (Hear, hear.) I have a little charity, however, towards the Evangelical Alliance. I do believe that they were blinded—that they were hoodwinked—that they were misled. (Hear.) I do not think they understood the matters before them. They were led away by such statements as these, that the slaveholders were compelled to hold their slaves. They could not emancipate them, if they would. There is just enough truth in this to prevent its being falsehood. There are laws which make emancipation depend upon expatriation; they say, that, if the master emancipates without removing the slave, the State may sell him again, and reduce him to slavery. But who are the makers of these laws? Why, the masters! (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") Dr. Marsh had the hardihood, in Newcastle, when called to say how it was, that, if the American influence of morality had swept away intemperance, it had not swept away slavery, to declare, that, if they emancipated their slaves, they would be thrown into the penitentiary. (Hear, hear.) It was statements of this kind that led the Alliance astray. I wish to undeceive you. Slaveholders are not compelled to hold their slaves. (Hear.) If they would leave

it to the slaves for five minutes, they would decide the question. (Cheers.) Let the slaveholder say, I have done with you—I cannot hold you in my conscience as slaves any longer. You cannot be free in the south, but there is an alternative. The British Lion prowls on three sides—there is Canada on the east; Canada on the north; and Canada on the west. Go there and be free; go to the British Lion, and be freed from the talons and the beak of the American Eagle! (Tremendous cheering.) All that the slaveholders have to do is to say, "Go." But what if the law of the land does make it impossible for a man legally to emancipate his slave? There is one outlet yet. The slaveholder can leave the land, and if the slaveholding Christians of the south would only take that step, what a sublime spectacle would it present to see the Christians marching out abreast. It would present a sublimer spectacle than the Evangelical Alliance—not like Dr. Cox leaving the Evangelical Alliance to maintain the honour of the slaveholder and slaveholding, but to see them marching out of the slave states, shaking off the dust of their feet, leaving them as Lot left Sodom that he might avoid the destruction that the guilty city justly merited. (Cheers.) The slaveholding religionists are not driven to this extremity. They might emancipate if they would. I do not believe, that, if they emancipated on the soil, the Legislature would dare to interfere with the slave. These slaveholders govern the States, and it is not to be expected that they would re-enact their slavery. (Cheers.) One allusion to the prayers in the Alliance. I have been accustomed to prayers all my days in connexion with slavery. My master, the man who now claims me, is a praying man, who has almost bound himself by an oath, that, if I set my foot on the soil, I shall be reduced to slavery again. That man prays, morning, noon, and night. Yet I have seen him tie up my cousin, lash her with a cow-skin till the warm blood would drop at her feet, and, in justification of this, he would quote this passage of Scripture: "He that knew his master's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." (Shame!) I have seen my master's brother take my own brother, strike him against the ground, and stamp upon him till the blood gushed from his mouth. (Loud cries of "Shame!") I have seen this amidst prayer; and every triumph that has been achieved amidst religious bodies in America has always been succeeded by prayer. When the American assembly was called upon in Philadelphia a few years since, to say that slavery was a sin against God, it was voted by the general assembly that it is not for the assembly to take action upon the subject. As soon as that was done, Dr. Cox, the leader of the American delegates in the Alliance, jumped up and thanked God that Vesuvius was capped! that they had got rid of the question of slavery, and that now the work was done. While the poor slave was bleeding, his heart broken, and he was lifting up imploring hands calling upon them in the name of that God whom they professed to love, to speak a word in his behalf, the body voted that it was inexpedient to do so, and Dr. Cox thanks God that the question of slavery is got rid of. So with the Methodist—so with the Presbyterians. In 1834, the latter declared against slavery; but in 1836, in Cincinnatti, they declared they had no right, no wish, no intention to interfere with masters and slaves; which is to say, that they had no right, no wish, no intention to give freedom to three millions of slaves in their land. That is the position of these Reverend Doctors, who have led astray British members in the Evangelical Alliance on the question of slavery. They dare not go back to America as connected with the Alliance, if anything had been registered against slavery by that Alliance. They knew it—they knew who their masters were, and unless they could get liberty to reseind what they had done, they must have left the Alliance. Their prayers were only intended to strengthen their hearts for the conflict, for they were only praying that they might stick more closely to slavery than ever. (Hear, hear.) I know the prayers of slaveholders. I have been the slave of religious and irreligious slaveholders, and I bear my testimony, that next to being a slave at all, I regard the greatest calamity to be that of belonging to a religious slaveholder. (Cries of hear, and cheers.) I have found them the most mean, the most exacting, the most cruel. This is a startling position, but it is true as far as my experience is concerned. I know not how to explain it, but such is the fact. The religious slaveholders are the most tenacious of slavery. I wish the people of this country to be acquainted with the divisions that have taken place with respect to the Methodist church. It is believed here, that there is an anti-slavery and a pro-slavery Methodist Episcopalian church; that the Methodist church, north and south, differ entirely with regard to that subject; but I wish you to understand that the Methodist church south is no more pro-slavery than the methodist church north. The former is honest in declaring its adherence to slavery—the former has been governed by expediency, and, in 1844, after the divison took place, Bishop Andrew became a slaveholder by marriage. He had the power of emancipating his slaves, and, coming to the slave conference, and being called upon to do so, said he would not. (Hear, hear,) A resolution was introduced, to the following effect: "That Bishop Andrew be, and he hereby is requested to suspend his labours till he has got rid of his impediment!" (Laughter and cheers.) We have various ways of covering slavery. We call it sometimes a peculiar institution—the patriarchal institution—the civil and domestic institution, but it was left for the Methodists to coin a new phrase by which to designate slavery, and it is, "The Impediment!" He was requested to suspend his labour till he had got rid of his impediment. (Laughter and cheers.) One might have thought it was his newly-married wife. (Laughter.) How long do you think it took the Conference to settle this question? Just three times as long as it took the Evangelical Alliance to settle the compromise—three weeks. They had prayers for the Committee to examine the matter—they had Conferences that they might be brought to an harmonious resolution. They fasted and prayed, and had communion and prayed, and had love-feasts and prayed. They held class-meetings and prayed, and held all kinds of meetings for three weeks, and came to the determination that Bishop Andrews be, and hereby is—what?—suspended? No; but requested to suspend himself till he got rid of his impediments,—only requested! He was left to determine how he should get rid of the slaves. Had the bishop become a sheep-stealer instead of a man-stealer, he would have been cut off at once. Had the Evangelical Alliance the other day had to do with sheep-stealing, had they known how much better a man is than a sheep, they would at once have declared against the slaveholders. (Loud cheers.) I wish to say a word about another thing, and that is to the friends of the spread of the Gospel and the circulation of the Bible—I want you to remember that there are three millions of people within fourteen days' sail of your own island, who know not what it is to have the Bible, who are denied by the American Christians to learn to read the name of Almighty God. These men are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and

I hope you will consider them as such; they are your brethren,—I hope you will consider them as such. (Cheers.) They have no Bible, and it is penal to instruct them to read. I have a proposition for British Christians, and I will call on them to aid me in what I am now about to propose. It is this, that a large sum of money be raised in England for the special purpose of procuring Bibles, with the express understanding that they are to be placed on shipboard, and for the purpose of supplying the negroes, not in heathen lands, but in Christian America. (Cheers.) I should like to see that ship loaded with the Gospel, loaded with Bibles, her sails spread to the breeze, manned by a Christian crew, and a Christian captain, having on board true Christian missionaries to expound the words of the Inspired Volume to those slaves, with the understanding that they were to land on the American shores. I should like to see that ship riding before the gentle gale, freighted with light and life, to the United States. (Cheers.) I should like to see another result that would follow. I know that the slaveholders, the Christian slaveholders, would shoulder their muskets, buckle on their swords to fight with the Bible, to fight away Christianity. They dread the spread of the Gospel among the slaves. (Hear, hear.) But the experiment is worth trying. What a spectacle for men and angels to look upon,—Christian England demanding the right to preach the Gospel, coming to the very doors of St. Peter's, to Hindostan, to China, but battled off by the arms of the Christian Evangelical States of America! (Hear, hear.) Let it be tried, and it would warn the earth. If the money be raised, and they are not allowed to land the Bibles, they would not be lost, they might be given to others. (Hear, hear.) America has again and again declared that it would not entertain the proposition of giving the Bible to the slave. I know that they are men as I am—I know that I am a man. (Cheers.) I feel glad to be in England; mighty glad to be in England. (Loud cheers.) I thank such as have invited me to stay; I know their hearts. It was Dr. Campbell—(loud cheers)—who, in another place in this city, with the noble generosity of his soul, brought forward a proposition to raise an amount of money to bring my family to this land. The money was raised—(cheers)—and I thought at the time that I must bring them here; but, on reflection, I was fearful, that, if I settled down here, I might forget my brethren in bonds—(hear,)—and I have, therefore, resolved to go back, whether in slavery or freedom, to do what I can to release from chains those whom I have left behind me. (Cheers.) But I will not go just yet. I want to go through the length and breadth of this land, and, with what ability God has blessed me, I wish to unmask the hypocritical pretensions of America—to raise the hatchway, to go down into the dungeons of American slavery, and let you see the names burned with the red-hot iron into the quivering flesh of the bondmen and bondwomen. (Sensation.) I thank you for the manner you have received the resolutions that have been moved to-night; it will do more for the cause of Christianity, in my opinion, than all the meetings of the Evangelical Alliance put together. (Cheers.) While nobody will care for what the Evangelical Alliance has done, the slaveholder will see in this demonstration, the concentration of anti-slavery sentiment in England, and he will not dare to venture here again. I hope the feeling will be continued, that the League may grow and prosper, till every slave throughout America and all other lands shall be freed from his chains. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. W. L. Garrison moved, and Mr. G. Thompson seconded, a vote of thanks to the Chairman; which was put and carried by acclamation.

The Chairman, in acknowledging the resolution, expressed his gratification at the unanimous conclusion to which the meeting had come, and the interest continued to be manifested in the subject up to that late hour, more than half-past ten o'clock. He trusted that their friends from America would learn that the Anti-slavery opinion of England was to be lasting as England itself. (Loud cheers.)

At the close of the meeting, Luke J. Hansard contributed 50*l.*, and Thomas Sturge 5*l.*, to the funds.

The vast audience then dispersed.

Patriot Sep. 17. 1846

MR. GEORGE THOMPSON.

Sir,—I have just received from Mr. Murray a number of the Volumes of his "Library," and in Vol. XXXV.—"Letters from Madras, by a Lady,"—we have the following passage:—

"Our last papers bring an account of a Society in England for protecting the Natives of India, with a very clever and true speech from a Mr. Thompson. Who is he? He puts a few tigers and boa constrictors into his speech, just to keep up attention, I suppose; but it is a capital speech, and *his accounts of the shameful taxation, &c., are not in the least exaggerated.*".—(Page 128.)

It is not a little gratifying to find a competent and evidently unprejudiced witness bearing this voluntary testimony to the accuracy of a man to whose overpowering eloquence nations have done willing homage, but whose truth, to serve the party interests of the passing hour, is sometimes recklessly and basely impugned.

With a growing abhorrence of slavery, and regard for all the sincere and consistent friends of universal emancipation, and offering you my humble tribute of thanks for your own fearless, independent, and upright course, relative to pending questions respecting American slavery,

I remain,

Your fellow-labourer to the end,

JOHN CAMPBELL.

Tabernacle House, London, Sept. 16.

Patriot Sep. 17. 1846 56

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND SLAVERY.

SIR,—One is perfectly at a loss to account for the very feeble tone, on the subject of slavery, which has been adopted by the members of the Evangelical Alliance.

One speaker is reported to have said: "If you introduce a resolution against the admission of slaveholders, you will dissolve the Alliance." Yet no man rose and indignantly replied: "Let this Alliance be scattered to the winds, rather than that we should give any countenance to such an iniquitous system as that of slavery." And, at the last public meeting, the members were found to tolerate such a remark as this, from an American speaker, in reference to slaveholding: "They must not exalt matters of secondary and minor importance into essentials."

And now Mr. Alexander King, Independent minister, comes forward and insults the Convention, by calling slavery a "matter of opinion;" and, in his third protest, calls slaves "personal property." Would he be admitted to hold such language to any other body in Great Britain? Would he escape the withering sarcasm of Daniel O'Connell or Douglas Jerrold, had he dared to breathe such sentiments in their presence? Let Mr. Alexander King wear the collar for but one week, and, when driven to the cotton-field by the lash, be told the propriety or impropriety of this treatment is a mere "matter of opinion,"—I think he would soon decide that slaveholding is something more than a question of "personal property." But why so in his case, and not in that of the negro?

Then, Sir, we find a large body of Americans protesting against the exclusion of slaveholders from the society, because they were not informed that such would be the case previous to their voyage. Surely this plea can be of no avail. They ought to have known our sentiments—and that we should not be expected to fraternise with men living in the open commission of that sin. Duellists and gamblers might plead for admission on the same argument. These gentlemen say, in the fourth reason they have given for their protest, "If Christian brethren," coming into possession of slaves by no fault of their own, "conduct themselves worthily, they merit, on that account, in our view, the sympathy of their fellow-Christians." Undoubtedly so, and in our view also; but we consider that the immediate emancipation of those slaves would be the only conduct "worthy" of a Christian brother.

The Alliance excludes such men as Mr. Sturge and the late Mr. Foster, of Bristol—the one because he has not been baptised with water, and the other because he received the threats to the wicked (death, destruction, and perishing) in their literal sense;—yet admit the men whose whole lives are one continued course of robbery; thereby making it a greater crime to misunderstand the text, "The wages of sin is death," than to disregard the woe which is pronounced in another text against him who useth his neighbour's service without wages. R.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

SIR,—In these days of Christian union, the following letter will be read with deep interest. It was addressed to the Rev. John Wesley, and was printed by him in the first volume of the *American Magazine*. I transcribe it, in order to show that, with all the admitted defects of modern piety, Christians of our day have learned a lesson which their fathers thought unattainable—unity amidst diversity.

Yours truly,

Manchester, Sept. 4, 1846. D. E. FORD.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND CHRISTIAN UNION.

SIR,—Will you oblige me by inserting this line or two, just to state, that in my letter which appeared in last Monday's *Patriot*, I represent myself to have associated with "Papists and Methodists, &c.," and that my brethren have done the same. I meant to have written, "Baptists and Methodists, &c.," and think I did so; but I suppose the word "Baptist" was so written as to be easily taken for "Papist."

I am, sir, obediently yours,

A WARWICKSHIRE PASTOR.

Sept. 15, 1846.

SIR,—While different opinions may be cherished as to the practicability and adaptation of the Evangelical Alliance, for the object proposed by it, there can be only one opinion as to the desirableness of that object. Some philosophers would say, that a general demonstration of union is valuable only as it is afforded by those who give exhibitions of it in their particular circumstances and spheres of influence. We know that philanthropy and universal benevolence cannot arise from the grave where domestic affection or social virtue has been buried. No more can the expansive spirit of universal love and Christian brotherhood exist in the bosoms of those who fail, in their different localities, to show union of heart and soul with those around them. General protestations, or even actions, in favour of Christian union cannot be deemed really valuable, unless they proceed from those who show its spirit on all occasions to the disciples of Jesus Christ, of whatever name, with whom they come in contact. If, then, in one respect at least, it is now too late to ascend from the particular to the general, the order may with profit be reversed. Let the members of the Alliance—let all Christians—strive to carry out, in their various spheres of active labour or places of residence, the spirit enforced at the recent meetings. For instance: last Lord's-day the Baptist and Congregational churches in Oxford sat down together in George-street Chapel, to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. The season was felt to be one of holy enjoyment and spiritual profit by not a few. Circumstances, wholly unconnected with the Evangelical Alliance, led to this pleasing manifestation of union, yet its effect was not, perhaps, the less likely to be salutary and abiding. Now, might not this plan be adopted frequently by the churches of different denominations throughout the country? It could not fail to have a blessed influence, and be more productive of good than many sermons or even volumes on the subject of union. It would be a palpable exhibition of that essential *oneness* of principle, spirit, and hope which belongs to all the followers of Jesus Christ; nor could it be adopted without profit to the churches themselves. Of course, it could not be expected that those who are bound down, either by sentiment or system, to one duly authorised ministry, and one proper administration of the ordinance, would favourably entertain such a method of showing union except in one way, or on one side, yet how many Christians, not so fettered, might derive advantage from it?

That the Great Head of the Church may bless every effort made to lessen and remove differences, and to promote union amongst the people, is the prayer of

Sir, yours, very truly,

Margate, 4th Sept., 1846. JAMES SPENCE.

"Philadelphia, Sept. 11, 1747.

"Rev. and Very Dear Sir,—Not long ago, I received your kind letter dated in February last. Your others, I believe, came to hand, and I hope, ere now, you have received my answers. My heart is really for an outward as well as inward union. Nothing shall be wanting on my part to bring it about; but I cannot see how that can possibly be effected till we all think and speak the same things. However, I agree in giving an universal offer to all poor sinners that will come and taste of the waters of life. But it is difficult to determine such matters at a distance. Some time next year, if the Redeemer spares my life, I hope to see you face to face. In the meantime, while the language of my heart is—

"'Oh let us find the ancient way,
Our wandering foes to move,
And force the heathen world to say,
See how these brethren love!'

"I hope ere long to be delivered from my outward embarrassments; I long to owe no man anything but love. This is a debt, reverend Sir, I shall never be able to discharge to you or your brother: Jesus will pay you all. For his sake I love and honour you very much, and rejoice as much in your success as in my own. I cannot agree with you in some principles; but that need not hinder love, since I trust we hold the foundation, even Jesus, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

"The Lord bless what is right, and rectify what is wrong in us all! Even so, Lord Jesus. Amen. Oh for heaven, when we shall mistake, and judge, and grieve one another no more! Lately, I have thought I was sailing several times into the blessed harbour, but it seems I must put out to sea again. My Redeemer's will be done! Reverend Sir, I salute you for my dear fellow-pilgrim, who is gone forwards. Continue to pray for us, and assure yourselves that you are always remembered by,

"Reverend and very dear Sir,

"Your most affectionate, though unworthy younger brother, and willing servant, for Christ's sake,

"GEORGE WHITEFIELD."

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

(From the *Christian's Penny Record.*)

How it is possible to admit slaveholders to an Evangelical Alliance, we confess we cannot understand. To receive "Hope H. Slatter, the great negro-trading Methodist of Baltimore," and to reject Joseph John Gurney, the eminent philanthropist of Norwich, appears to us the greatest solecism in Christian morals that ever was exhibited to an astonished world. We may be told, however, that the basis of the Alliance is doctrinal, and not practical, and that we have no right to enforce a moral principle as a test of membership. Out upon such hypocrisy! The basis is "doctrinal and not practical." What is doctrine without practice? Of what value is faith without works? Can a Christian be a slaveholder? What is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, with respect to our social duties? Do unto others as you would they should do unto you. Is it the will of the slaveholder that the slave whom he keeps in bondage should make him a slave, if he possessed the power? The idea is absurd—too absurd to be seriously refuted. By this one act, the Evangelical Alliance has stultified its whole proceedings, forfeited the confidence of the religious world, and excited the most painful feelings in the minds of those whose hearts were yearning for the exhibition of the oneness of the universal church.

(From the *Banner of Ulster*)

We have sometimes asked, and oftener heard the questions, "What is the Evangelical Alliance to do?" "What can it do?" It cannot aid the oppressed either at Madeira or Tahiti by fleets and armies—by the sabre of seamen or the bayonet of soldiers. It has not, it cannot have, any vocation of that nature. Still, it can, and it should, act. Immediately after its formation, work appears prepared for its members. They are of different countries, different forms, different politics, and one faith. This one agreement meeting, with many discords, conquers them all and gives the members one common object.

A large class of politicians say, that there exists a mortal and necessary struggle between civilisation and ignorance, and they tell us that it must proceed until the aboriginal inhabitants of many lands are swept from the earth. We see the struggle, believe in its mortality, and disbelieve its necessity. True civilisation never prospers in the use of violent and criminal means—for, if true, it cannot use them. The business of this Alliance—stretching into all countries, embracing the east and the west, extending from north to south—is to unite and systematise the efforts of its members, not by direct intervention, but by counsel, advice, and exhortation. Thus, it may extend missionary efforts, and it may render them more systematic. In this way it will aid to tame the wildness of the Caffres' hearts, and rob the swamps of the Indus, with cultivation, of their poisons and their fevers.

Tahiti and Madeira are different cases. They demand the intervention and mediation of all good and peaceable men. This Alliance presents the opportunity of combining together, not for wrathful purposes, all who hate oppression and "persecution for conscience' sake." France cannot afford to sustain the remonstrances, indignation, and contempt of enlightened men from all countries. Louis Philippe may be proud, and M. Guizot cold and stiff; but they should, and, what is more, they would, bow beneath the appeals that this body might present before them. Public opinion is undoubtedly powerful; and the public opinion of many countries could scarcely be resisted by the Citizen King. When the Evangelical Alliance declared itself not a political body, it was easy to understand the term, and yet see that it might exercise an influence over and purify politics, by uniting men of many countries in good works, and making them most influential mediators between the oppressor and the oppressed—between Tahiti and France on one hand—the peasant women of Madeira and the Queen of Portugal on the other.

Liverpool Mercury. Sep. 25/46 58

PUBLIC BREAKFAST OF THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

On Monday morning, the American ministers and brethren who had come over to this country to take part in the recent proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, in London, were entertained at a public breakfast, by the Liverpool members and friends of the alliance, at the Music-hall, Bold street. The repast was provided by Mr. Hiles, in his usual liberal style, and about 700 ladies and gentlemen sat down. Alexander Dunlop, Esq. presided. The American gentlemen present consisted of the Rev. Dr. Cox. of Brooklyn, the Rev. Mr. Wheelock, of Rochester, and Samuel Ashmead, Esq., of Philadelphia. Amongst the ministers and gentlemen present, were the Rev. Dr. Byrth, rector of Wallasey, the Rev. W. W. Ewbank, incumbent of St. George's, Everton, and the Rev. J. Cordeaux, minister of St. Silas's, Pembroke-place; the Rev. J. Welsh, of the Free Church of Scotland; the Rev. John Todd Brown, of the Church of Scotland; the Rev. Mr. Graham, of the Scotch Secession Church; the Rev. Mr. Birrell, the Rev. Mr. Davis, and the Rev. Mr. Edwards, of the Baptist Church; the Rev. Mr. Wylie, of the Scotch Baptist Church; the Rev. D. Massie, of Manchester, the Rev. Mr. Massie, of Newton, the Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Prescot, the Rev. Thomas Woodwark, the Rev. J. Bruce, the Rev. John Kelly, and the Rev. Mr. Appleford, of the Independent Church; the Rev. Mr. Rees, of the Welsh Baptist Church; the Rev. Mr. Hughes, of the Calvinistic Methodist Church; the Rev. Mr. Hacking, of the Associated Methodist Church; the Rev. George Osborne, of the Wesleyan Church; the Reverends W. Smith, J. Rees, J. Leppington, C. Jackson, and E. Walker; John Cropper, Esq., Thomas Sands, Esq., Thomas Kaye, Esq., John Howard, Esq., Charles Robertson, Esq., Thomas Crook, Esq., Thomas Blackburn, Esq., James Crosfield, Esq, David Rowland, Esq., Thomas Jeffreys, Esq., and a great many others. The Rev. W. Bevan was absent from indisposition. Grace was said by the Rev. J. Welsh; and after breakfast the whole assembly rose and joined in singing the hymn—

> "Come let us join our cheerful songs,
> With angels round the throne."

After which a portion of Scripture was read, and a prayer offered up by the Rev. J. Cordeaux.

The CHAIRMAN, after congratulating the assembly on the object which had been the means of bringing them together, alluded to the departure of their brethern, who would, as had been well expressed, go to their native land, their to raise the banner, not a banner around which men are to unite for warlike purposes, although it be a tri-coloured one, but the banner of love; and under it, he trusted, they would be enabled to rally an immense army who, with faith, hope, and love as their motto, will unite in ascribing glory, honour, and praise to Him who has declared that "the day shall come when His law shall be in every heart, and his love in every soul."

The Rev. Dr. BYRTH, Rector of Wallasey, said the object for which they had met was one of the most important that could engage the attention of Christians. "Christians from America and other parts of the world," continued the Reverend Gentleman, "have visited our shores upon former occasions, on errands of Christian philanthropy, but I believe, I speak the truth when I say that, upon no occasion before the present, was there an assembly convened of all portions of the Christian church, in this country, in order to greet them, or to address unto them a valediction. And, assuredly, if there were no other purpose, but that which is the object of this meeting, that in itself would be much calculated to produce a strong impression upon every Christian heart. Especially would it be so if, Mr. Chairman, like yourself, and many by whom you are surrounded, all who are present on this occasion had had the opportunities, with which we have been privileged, of witnessing the holy zeal, listening to the consecrated eloquence, and partaking of the devout affections of those distinguished individuals. (Hear and applause.) Never will there be obliterated—I will venture, sir, to speak for you as well as myself—the impressions made upon our minds by our intercourse with our American friends. To the last day of our lives, whether or no we see them again, shall we cherish those as among our best and holiest associations, and feel that we shall look forward with something like invigorated confidence to that meeting where there shall be no separation—to that Alliance which shall be in the presence of our common Lord and Master." As a member of the Church of England he would yield to none; and whatever might be thought of his associating with his Dissenting brethren by those who understood not the real object of Christian charity, he anticipated no danger from having the cords of love drawn towards the members of other communions. (Cheers.) He added,—"And I should be happy to bear my testimony in the highest places of the earth—and whenever I can bear it faithfully shall it be borne—to the great fact, that I have not met with any thing during my connexion with this, which I venture to call a holy alliance—(hear, hear)—which has made me feel that one member of it had a hostile disposition towards the church to which I belong, and full well I have known that with regard to that church my own affections have not been diminished, and blessed be God I have tokens of good in my own ministrations—it may seem enthusiasm to think so—which I connect with my having given my adhesion to this blessed cause." (Hear, hear.) He did not hesitate to say that no cause ever appeared more promising. Their brethren would cross the Atlantic, and tell there, far and wide, that they had met with a response to every invitation to the reciprocal exercise of love, and that there had been a bond of union formed between the two countries more powerful than any political compact—(loud applause)—outlasting every arrangement that shall have for its object the welfare of the one country or the interests of both, perhaps contributing on some future day of misunderstanding to allay angry passions, and taking from the hands of the warrior the weapons he was about to employ against his brother-man—that is, against his Christian brother—and placing them at the foot of the cross. He then gave an account of the transactions in London, in which, morning after morning and evening after evening, a thousand persons of different sections of Christ's church, and among them some of the profoundest divines of all the civilized countries of the earth, had met together; and, amidst all their discussions, however zealous the speakers, he never heard one word which was unbecoming a Christian. (Hear, hear.) "I ask," said he, "this large assembly if such a fact as this be not in itself an evidence that there was presiding over us a Spirit better than our own will? Our object was one which we could confidently call unto Him to look down upon and to bless. More than all this—the Evangelical Alliance not only exhibited in the midst of its most agitating occasions this blessed spirit of mutual forbearance, but Christian union was preserved entire. (Hear, hear.) We were unanimous upon every thing on which unanimity is desirable. (Applause.) We met together, it is true, as the synod of a council, or convocation, or whatever men will choose to call us, but without pretending to Tridentine infallibility we exceeded in more than Tridentine unanimity; and the world never before exhibited such a spectacle as that." (Hear, and loud applause.) With regard to their past transactions, each had given to the other the right hand of fellowship, and no one had ever gone away without feeling it as his own fault if he were not a better man—better prepared to love his fellow-Christian—more convinced of his own infirmities, having a clearer and stronger light thrown upon the importance of unanimity with regard to the great doctrines of the gospel—and feeling that they might retain their respective differences, and yet all combine in the prosecution of one common object. (Applause.) He conceived that many of the affecting characteristics of their late meeting had been derived from their American friends; and if they had not been present, the Alliance would have been much

weakened. Turning to the American ministers, he observed that they had come to bid them farewell. He thanked them for their labours in the blessed cause and the noble spirit they had testified; also for the warmth which they had supplicated at the throne of the Divine grace blessings upon them; for their expressions of Christian love, chastened at the same time by Christian prudence, manly and dignified, while warm and enduring. "We thank you," said he "for all these things, and, in the name of the Lord, we say unto you, because you have a right to the prayer, in the name of the Lord—Farewell! (Hear, hear, and great applause.) May it be well with you in every relation!—well with you in your own bosoms!—well with you in your intercourse with our common Lord!—well with you in your domestic relations!—well with you as ministers of the Gospel!—well with you and your congregations!—well with you in the hour of death and day of judgment!—well with you throughout eternity! (Enthusiastic applause.) When friends separate, my Rev. Brethern, there often arises a feeling that they shall never meet again. The word 'farewell' is often associated with many forebodings, and it may be that in the flesh we shall never meet again. And yet I speak confidently when I say, that if I were to utter, without having been officially commissioned to give utterance to the invitation—'Oh! come back to us as soon as you can again'—(hear, hear)—if I were to say that it would indeed be a bright day in our spiritual history if we could expect to see Dr. Cox—(cheers)—and Mr. Church—(cheers)—and Dr. Patten—(cheers)—I should fail in recollecting the names of all, though my memory shall never forget their blessed characters—(hear)—if I were to say this, the invitation would be echoed by every individual to whom I am nowspeaking." (Applause) He hoped they would come again, and some of them might cherish the hope of even seeing them beyond the Atlantic. They would, however, meet again, and he looked forward to that meeting where there would be no valedictions, no tears, because there would be no separations, no trials of their natural affections, nothing to obscure even for a moment the brightness of Christian love, where they would be all for ever as one person, looking back upon the past, and to that day among the number, with thankfulness, looking to that God who led them so far through the wilderness, and at length gave them that oasis in the desert; and the remembrance of that occasion would give something of an enhancement even to the felicity of heaven! In conclusion, he hoped they would remember them when they crossed the mighty Atlantic, that they would pray for them, and by every effort draw closer the bonds of Christian love, so that it might be made known to all the world that they were one. The Rev. Gentleman resumed his seat amidst enthusiastic demonstrations of applause.

The Rev. Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn, replied, observing that, from the valediction which they had received from the British Christians, he hoped they would accept their benediction. He trusted the blessing of the great God might rest on our youthful Queen, the Royal Family, and the British Parliament, with all the Christians and interests of this incomparable island, the centre of a circle that girds the world. His friends in America had in principle felt a constant and unfeigned deprecation of any breach in the amicable relations of the two countries, as what he conceived to be the worst specimen of national parricide, but they had there, in a hundred and a thousand ways, sought to rectify and electrify public sentiment in favour of perpetual peace. "Often," said he, "have I prayed in my own pulpit, with the 'amen' of all my people, for the British realm, for the British Queen, and for the interests of Great Britain, to be sanctified and blessed as the great bulwark of Protestantism. It is our hearty prayer at this moment, and we see no treason in it against our own '*Et pluribus unum*,' borne aloft amid the stars by the clear-sighted eagle." (Hear, hear, hear.) When they asked him what he was going across the ocean for, he said to them, "What did the Lord Jesus Christ come across the universe for? It was the love of Christ that brought him there. They had assembled upon the principle that the things in which they agreed were fundamental and far greater than those about which they differed, and he was reminded of what had been said by a pious blackman, who observed, that learned gentlemen quarrelled about little things like a set of children at school, who cracked their nuts, and having eaten the kernel, disputed about the shells. Wherever he found a man loving Christ, whatever ulcers, freckles, or infelicities he might have on his face, whether he be black or white, whether he be dressed in purple like Dives, or in rags, like Lazarus, he was his brother, and he would take him by the hand. (Loud applause.) The principle of the alliance was one of the purest in the evangelical doctrine; only let the structure be well laid, and let its friends prosecute the scheme by means as good as the end to be achieved, and he was with them heart and soul. After several illustrations of the truth and importance of the principle they were desirous of carrying out, the speaker exhorted his brethern to Christian love and unity, and to adopt the maxim of "Love one another, loving Christ as your Redeemer," and it would never be in the power of the Congress at Washington or the Government of England to misunderstand each other. (Cheers.) He invited them to come to America in 1850, as Sir Culling Eardley Smith had stated they were going to Geneva in 1848, and he could assure them the only difficulty would be to get amphitheatres and free-trade halls enough to hold their auditors. After paying a compliment to the Rev. William Bevan, he proceeded to state some of the stories at which they had to weep. "They are," said he, "known under one word, and that word is 'slavery.' (Hear, hear.) Sir, I do not think that upon that subject there is one of us Americans who has caught one new idea in England. I like the gush of pious humanity which I have seen in this island; do you think I regret it? I do not see how you could have better shown your hatred of slavery; but you have not advanced one argument against it which we have not already recognised as true. The question, Mr. Chairman, is not with us; we settled it long ago. My great-grandfather settled it before Wilberforce ever spoke upon it. My father and mother taught me the anti-slavery doctrine from my earliest youth, and I never have doubted the truth of it. (Cheers,) The question, however, in America is just this—What are the best means to be employed? and our motto is, 'Wisdom is profitable to direct.' What are the best means which Christians ought to use for the achievement of that great end?—the removal from our country and from the world, that is, the whole Christian world, of that stain to humanity—slavery? That is the whole question. We ought not to do evil that good may come: ought we? If any of you should entertain a doubt upon that, I tell you I would rather die than doubt it for a moment. God himself never did evil that good might come; and he will never, and he does not allow us. We must seek good ends by good means. (Hear, hear.) Now, there are some persons in America who would have a way of doing this thing, the removal of slavery, with which we of the Evangelical Alliance cannot agree. Not that I have ever changed my principles; for, if I know myself, I can never change my principles, except from strength to strength. (Cheers.) If I am not the friend of the black man and the red man, as well as the brown man, the tawney, and the white, then am I not the friend of man at all, and I am not the friend of Christ, who died for all men. (Cheers.) I am happy to tell you, what I believe is not thoroughly known in England, that fifteen states of the north out of thirty—and with more of them deeply mortgaged to freedom—are free at this moment; and the movement in favour of anti-slavery will still be forward! forward! forward! in favour of freedom. Did you ever hear of the chariot of the sun rolling backward? You will hear of that, in my opinion, before you ever hear of a free state in America becoming again a slave state. (Hear, hear.) And, upon

60 Patriot Oct 1. 1846

the borders, we see five other states in a state of transition, and, I believe, the state of Kentucky would have been a free state at this moment if it had not been for some unscrupulous, exasperating influences, which just made the slave-masters mad, when they ought to have been convinced. Twice in their Legislature was this question moved—Let us call a convention and alter the constitution, and make freedom and Kentucky commensurate. After great debates their votes were 68 to 67—67 for and 68 against; and those who were against it never said they wanted to eternize slavery. They only wished the question to be postponed to a more favourable period. They are determined that slavery shall not last long in that state. (Hear, hear.) As to Missouri, as to western Virginia, as to Maryland, and as to Delaware—where there are very few slaves—the question of anti-slavery is fast gaining ground. In the state of Maryland, the amount of property sacrificed in the slaves that had been set free amounted to more than the British Parliament voted to slaveholders when it made the colonial dependencies free, and if the aggregate amount sacrificed by all the free states were made known, it would astonish them." He contended that the way to abolish slavery was to win over the masters by kind arguments, and any measures, the tendency of which would be to produce bloodshed, would be opposed to the interests of the slaves, and to the interests of Christ and conscience. Had they read in vain the history of the border wars, the carnage of Flodden Field, the misery of Chevy Chase, or the fifteenth century, with its scenes of blood; if a civil war took place in America, an awful deluge of blood would flow that would make the civil wars of England to be forgotten, and crush the hopes of the black man in the conflict. They wanted no scenes of blood in America; the time was come when they must shed ink, and not blood; they must use the pen and not the sword. They could lead public sentiment, and hasten the period when there should be no slaves, even in Texas. All the men who came from America to join in the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, representing twelve or thirteen denominations of Christians—all voted alike on this subject; and if any man dared to say that they were pro-slavery men in the meetings of the Evangelical Alliance, he said before his Maker and before them all—it is a lie. (Cheers.) He knew what pro-slavery was, and never advocated pro-slavery doctrines there. They meant to use the influence of the Evangelical Alliance in America, which he believed would be fortunate for doing away with slavery. In conclusion, he bid them farewell, adding that they took leave of the land of their fathers with an increased affection for the Christians of Great Britain, and feeling that they had not come in vain, he hoped shortly to see many of the friends then around him in the State of New York, where they would find the hand of good fellowship always extended towards them, and warm hearts and houses ready and open to receive them. (Loud cheers.)

After a prayer had been offered up by the Rev. Mr. Osborne, the meeting broke up about twelve o'clock.

The American ministers embarked for New York on Tuesday, in the Great Britain steamer.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

PUBLIC BREAKFAST AT THE MUSIC-HALL.—VALEDICTORY ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN DEPUTIES.

(From the *Liverpool Courier*.)

On Monday morning, the American ministers and brethren, who had come across the Atlantic to be present at the recent formation of the Evangelical Alliance, were entertained by the Liverpool members and friends of the Alliance, at a public breakfast, at the Music-hall, Bold-street. The breakfast was provided by Mr. Hiles, of Parker-street, and about 700 ladies and gentlemen sat down to it. The Chairman, Alexander Dunlop, Esq., of the Free Church of Scotland, and the principal guests, sat at the head table, from which six other tables extended down the entire length of the room. The American gentlemen present consisted of the Rev. Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn; the Rev. Mr. Wheelock, of Rochester; and Samuel Ashmead, Esq., of Philadelphia. Amongst the ministers and gentlemen present, we noticed the Rev. Dr. Byrth, rector of Wallasey; the Rev. W. W. Ewbank, incumbent of St. George's, Everton; and the Rev. J. Cordeaux, minister of St. Silas's, Pembroke-place; the Rev. J. Welsh, of the Free Church of Scotland; the Rev. John Tod Brown, of the Church of Scotland; the Rev. Mr. Graham, of the Scotch Secession Church; the Rev. Mr. Birrell, the Rev. Mr. Davis, and the Rev. Mr. Edwards, of the Baptist Church; the Rev. Mr. Wylie, of the Scotch Baptist Church; the Rev. Dr. Massie, of Manchester, the Rev. Mr. Massie, of Newton, the Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Prescot, the Rev. Thomas Woodwark, the Rev. J. Bruce, the Rev. John Kelly, and the Rev. Mr. Appleford, of the Independent Church; the Revs. Henry Rees, John Hughes, and J. Roberts, of the Welch Calvinistic Methodist Connexion; the Rev. William Rees, of the Welch Independent Church; the Rev. Mr. Hacking, of the Associated Methodist Church; the Rev. George Osborn, of the Wesleyan Church; the Revs. W. Smith, J. Rees, J. Leppington, C. Jackson, and E. Walker, John Cropper, Esq.; Thomas Sands, Esq.; Thomas Kaye, Esq.; John Howard, Esq.; Charles Robertson, Esq.; Thomas Crook, Esq.; Thomas Blackburn, Esq.; James Crosfield, Esq.; David Rowland, Esq.; Thos. Jeffery, Esq.; and a great many others. Grace was said by the Rev. J. Welsh; and, after breakfast, the whole assembly rose and joined in singing the hymn—

"Come let us join our cheerful songs,
With angels round the throne."

The Chairman then called upon the Rev. Mr. Cordeaux to read a portion of God's Word, and, in doing so, said, he had the painful intelligence to announce that their beloved brother, the Rev. W. Bevan, of the Independent Chapel, who had acted so efficiently as secretary in the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, was that day lying at home very seriously ill. He had to request, therefore, an interest in the prayers of the audience for him at the throne of grace.

The Rev. Mr. Cordeaux having here read the 17th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, concluded by offering an appropriate prayer for a blessing on the Alliance, and on every other instrumentality designed for the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom at home and abroad.

The Chairman said, the foreign brethren were about to return to their own countries; and he was sure they would not go without the heartfelt prayers of many,

many a brother ascending to the throne of grace, that he, the God of all grace, will go with them, watching over, protecting, preserving, and directing them.

The Rev. Dr. Byrth, Rector of Wallasey, was most warmly received on presenting himself to the audience. He said: Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen—Before I proceed to the direct object which devolves upon me in addressing those, our beloved friends themselves, I feel that I may be permitted—nay, I believe that I am expected—to say something respecting the occasion which did bring us together. (Hear.) As a member of the Church of England, yielding I believe to none, whatever may be thought of my association with my Dissenting brethren by those who understand not the real nature of Christian charity, I anticipate no danger to my beloved communion from having felt the cords of love drawn towards the members of other communions. (Great cheering.) And I should be happy to bear my testimony in the highest places of the earth—and whenever I can bear it faithfully shall it be borne—to the great fact, that I have not met with anything during my connexion with this, which I venture to call a holy alliance—(hear, hear)—which has made me feel that one member of it had a hostile disposition towards the Church to which I belong. It can be no valid imputation, either against the prudence or propriety of our measures, that, on the one hand, we are calumniated, and, on the other hand, let alone. We shall meet calumny and indifference, both of them separately or leagued together, with the Christian weapons of charity and forbearance. (Hear.) If some, zealous beyond knowledge, should plant their emissaries at our doors, and endeavour to sow dissensions in our holy assemblies, we shall not return reproaches for reviling, but we shall pursue our way dignified and self-abased, praying even for our enemies, while we know that it is possible that more than misapprehension may have mingled with the assaults they bring against us. And this is all we shall condescend to say with regard to such emissaries as those to whom I allude. As to those who are indifferent, we bring no charge against them. We venture to believe that the time is not remote when they shall be surprised at their own apathy, and when they will come in in numbers in order to swell our ranks and promote this blessed cause. (Hear and applause.) I have no fears respecting the Evangelical Alliance. We were unanimous upon everything on which unanimity is desirable. (Applause.) And, Mr. Chairman, in order now to proceed to the more direct object of my address, is it possible that we should let our American brethren and others from foreign countries depart without, in the first place, telling unto them that all this peace, that all this success, under God, was, in no small degree, owing to themselves? (Hear, and cheers.) Most unquestionably, if they had not been here, the Alliance would have been weakened. (Hear.) My rev. fathers and brethren, (continued Dr. Byrth, turning to the American ministers,) I come in the conclusion of this address to speak unto you to whom I am commissioned to deliver a valediction. The rev. Doctor then delivered a warm valediction, in the course of which he expressed an earnest hope of seeing the American brethren again, which was enthusiastically cheered.

The Rev. Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn, New York, rose to reply, and the cheering which greeted his appearance, was loud and long continued. He said: Mr. Chairman, my beloved brethren, Dr. Byrth, and you, Christians of Great Britain and of Liverpool, what shall I say, exhausted by the labours of a previous day, and week, and five months, and over whelmed with the applause and the spirit of the occasion? I seem to rise, Sir, not to speak, but simply to talk, and to feel, and to luxuriate in the unutterable and hallowed associations of this hour and place. I know not how to reply to what, though so proper an organ, you have expressed to me and my brethren; and on behalf of British Christians, and especially those whom the grand Evangelical Alliance includes for the Christians of the daughter country, for the Christians of the great western hemisphere, who speak your mother tongue, who read your Bible, who have your laws, and who have inherited some of the best things of your institutions, from the time of King Alfred, from the time of Edward the Sixth—that Josiah of the British throne, that youthful Christian. (Applause.) For your valediction, Sir, take our benediction, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. You say farewell to us—we say farewell to you. May the blessing of the great God rest upon your youthful Queen, and the Royal family, and the British Parliament, and all the Christians and interests of this incomparable island, the centre of a circle that girds the world. (Loud applause.) May the grace of God sanctify British influence, making it everywhere Christian, a blessing at home, a blessing to the antipodes. (Renewed applause.) Often have I prayed in my own pulpit, with the "amen" of all my people, for the British realm, for the British Queen, and for the interests of Great Britain, to be sanctified and blessed as the great bulwark of Protestantism. It is our hearty prayer at this moment, and we see no treason in it against our own "*E pluribus unum*," borne aloft amid the stars by the clear sighted eagle. (Hear, hear.) Sir, we came to your shores, so far as I know, myself and my brethren, from motives which, however mixed and imperfect—for who can understand his errors?—were, nevertheless, unearthly, evangelical, Christian, benevolent, and such as your piety has known and appreciated. (Hear.) Sir, we believe that the communion of saints is one of the most unearthly, sublime, eternal, unappreciated ties in the whole universe. We believe it transcends the boundaries of time and the littleness of space. We believe God to be its author, truth its atmosphere, heaven its metropolis. The love of the Christian—God planted it. God is its patron. He not only made the grand mechanism of the solar system, but the foundations upon which his footstool stands, as well as the counsels of his throne—all are based on the love of him. The love of the footstool is kindled alive in them whose affection begins with the throne; but if our affection begins with the throne, God forbid that it should for ever stay there—I mean by that, that we should have a kind of love for God that never shows itself in love to man. "If you love me," said Christ, "love one another; he that says, I love God, and loveth not his brother, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." My dear Mr. Chairman—for you are no stranger to us—I never heard of you till I saw you in the Alliance, and I shall never forget you now. (Hear, and applause.) I think, Sir, with the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, that, if the Alliance is to be a failure, I would rather fail in doing right, than be one of those lazy dreamers after orthodoxy, who never attempted to do right in this matter. I said the same thing in America before I came here. When they asked me, "What are you going across the ocean for?" said I to them "What did Jesus Christ come across the universe for?" It was the love of Christ that brought me here. "But," said Mr. Noel, "we have gained much already." Sir, there was very seldom, since the days of Burke or Cicero, so much put in a few

words. We have indeed gained much already. Is it nothing to enjoy the heavenly influence we have here? Why, the very eloquence we have just listened to gave *birth* to new affections. (Loud laughter, and applause.) I cared not, when listening to that eloquence, to recollect whether I was a Presbyterian or not, or whether he was a Churchman or not; for it seems that we belong to the same sect who were once everywhere spoken against, and whose union now is by many misunderstood and misrepresented. In the recent Convention, representing all the churches of the Protestant world, upon what principle, let me ask, did they assemble? Upon the principle that has been trampled in the dust and put under the brutal hoofs of sectarianism—the principle that the things in which we agree are fundamental and by far greater than those about which we differ. (Hear.) I recollect to have heard a pious black man say once in America, in reference to this subject, that learned gentlemen quarrelled about little things like a set of children at school who cracked their nuts, and, having eaten the kernels, quarrelled about the shells. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) We should, therefore, think of every object, of every being, and of everything according to its intrinsic nature and its relative importance. Whoever, then, is right or wrong in little things, I can only say for myself, that I feel happier in knowing, as I know now, that there are so many brethren and sisters in my Father's family. The Evangelical Alliance goes upon the principle of the eternal covenant of the grace of God, which included one of the sons of Jeroboam, because there was something in his heart towards God. How did God treat him? He loved God, and God pardoned his sins and took his soul to glory. Whenever, then, I find a man loving Christ, whatever ulcers, freckles, or infelicities he may have upon his face, whether he be white or black, whether he be dressed in purple, like Dives, or in rags, like Lazarus, he is my brother, and I take him by the hand. (Loud applause.) This, Sir, is the doctrine of the Evangelical Alliance. We have not done everything we might have desired, but is nothing done? By the grace of God, we have laid the foundation. Every one of us might say, in the glowing language of Horace, *exegi monumentum*. If we have not raised a monument, we have laid a foundation, and we trust God will raise the monument upon it by-and-by—a basis which pulls down no church at all, but is formed to promote the greatest amount of religious freedom among all denominations. I wish all to be free in body, as well as mind, to worship God in their own way. (Loud cheers.) Sir, there is a demonstration already made in favour of a great principle, which will live because it is true, because God is its patron, and because the millennium can never come without it. I have often asked myself, before joining any enterprise, has it truth for its basis? If it has, then, Sir, let the structure be well laid, and let its friends prosecute the scheme by means as good as the end to be achieved, and I am with them heart and soul. Sir, I believe the principle of the Evangelical Alliance is one of the purest and grandest in the Christian doctrine. God never said, "unless you be great philosophers you will all be lost;" and I bless God that we are not even to be saved altogether for our sanctity. Observers of ceremonials in the church, you will all be lost, as Dr. Beecher once said at a public meeting; and he was told by one of the auditors that the sentiment he was then uttering was contrary to one contained in one of his books. The doctor immediately said, "That may be very true; we are not to be saved by our consistency, and I claim the privilege of a Christian to say that I was wrong before, but that I intend to be right now." Well, this doctrine is ecumenical—a word voided from the vocabulary of Christians now, but rife when the Emperor Constantine called a council together, at the time when the Trinity was assailed by Arius. At that time the emperor became a Christian, and he sent his circular to call the churches together at Nice, to discuss that great question. And it was called ecumenical—meaning, thereby, the whole inhabited earth representing the truth. There has not anything like it appeared since the trumpet of Luther was blown, until now, when a representation has been made of the essential principles of the Protestant unity. "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment;" look at God's Word, and that only. What is the Pope's unity? As Mr. Monod, of France, said the other day at Manchester—it is *ab extra;* it comes from without, and presses man's body. God's unity gets into the soul and presses outwards; it is the truth of unity and love. As Napoleon said, "Win Paris and you have France;" God says, "Give me the heart and I have the man." Look at the principle on which Christians agree: the grandest is the Word of God; its divine inspiration, its authority and sufficiency,—the first article of our glorious basis. We hold it and believe it, and we ought not to forget it. We ought to hold it up that all the un-Catholic Roman Church should see that we are agreed there. Our differences are as moonshine and fogs compared with those grand points in which we are all united. I would like to know how high upon the top of the pyramid the poor fallible man need be stuck, living there higher up above the earth, and breathing a purer stratum of air, seeing a sun when it cannot be seen by the people below, in order that he may understand God's holy word. I wish to know if it be impossible for us to read our Maker's book, and understand it, without having all manner of nick-names, and names of Old Nick put upon us? (Cheers and laughter) If the Pope does not want my private judgment, he wants it as much as I want his. He is nothing but a man, and, alas! he is a man of sin. If I know why I am a Protestant, it is because I have read the Bible and believe it; it is because I have seen the full-length portraiture of the man of sin, drawn with the pencil of inspiration. Heaven and earth were witnesses of the folly of his infidelity, while what he has written grieves my heart, and the thing has come to pass as it was predicted. Well, Sir, I believe there never was a demonstration in which the essential principles of Christian Protestant union were more faithfully preserved than in this Alliance. I have felt, Sir, that there was a greater Protestant agreement amongst us than I could have anticipated. When a man was at prayer at one of our Alliance meetings in London—and we had seven or eight prayers a day, for they were the best part of the feast—I often heard a man next to me say, "I wonder what church he belongs to?" "Why," said I, "don't you see the one said shibboleth, and the other sibboleth, and can you not tell?"—for, in prayer, it was astonishing to see how the children of one family used their father's dialect. (Cheers.) Some one asked me once, when he saw the glorious gilded vestments of the Romish priests coming out of the vestry, what they meant? "Why," said I, "they are the vestments which cover all their sins." Sir, give me that unity, that truth, and grace, which the Spirit of the living God makes in the hearts of men—it is all the unity for which I care, and it is the only unity which ever made a Christian since the world began. But, Sir, I do not wish to expatiate too far, only that my love for the

principle of the Alliance is just as old as my love for the Lord Jesus Christ, which began in the year 1812, when I first bowed my knees to God in an agony of soul, and which I can never forget. Now, Mr. Chairman, we hope to return to America, to diffuse there from the *cornucopia* of your Alliance some of its heavenly paradisaical fruits; we go there with some little embarrassment on some accounts, but with hopes that overpower all. We go there encouraged by your prayers. I wish the illustrious Premier of England were here to understand what I say, when I say there is going to be an alliance with more electricity in it than in the telegraph—an alliance of love between the continent and the parent island, which shall last until the archangel's trumpet calls us all to rest at home with Christ. Sir, the time is coming when might will no longer be discerned as the maker of right, but when right will make might, and when moral power shall be the controller of physical power everywhere. (Tremendous cheering.) Let these two Christian nations love one another, loving Christ as their Redeemer, and it will never be in the power of the Cabinet at Washington, and the Parliament or the Privy Council of England, to misunderstand one another. (Loud cheers.) If a fog, or an iceberg, or a whale come between us, we shall soon drive it out of the way. (A laugh.) I think it proper to say, that the challenge which has been given for prayer is one that I intend to accept, and if I cannot throw my glove across the Atlantic, I will show my love. (Hear, hear.) Let us pray. Prayer is efficacious. Prayer moves the heart, that moves the hand, that moves the world. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. If ten such men as Abraham had been in Sodom, their prayers would have kept the lightning up above. While we are thus acting, God will take care of us and help us. And with reference to the hint of Dr. Byrth, about coming to America, neither he, nor any of you, be assured, will come uninvited or unwelcome. I invite you especially to come to America, in 1850. For Sir Culling Smith says, that in 1848 you are going to Geneva, to bless the Swiss and electrify France. Well, in 1850, you must come to America, and if I am alive I will do all in my power to prepare for you, and I promise you that the only difficulty will be to find churches, and amphitheatres, and free-trade halls large enough to hold your auditors. (Much applause.) Our hospitality will not be tasked, or taxed, or tested: it will outbreak by its exuberance. You will be right welcome; and after seeing us you will understand us better, and it will be no wonder if you give us right hands after giving us right hearts. (Applause.) Such a meeting I do believe to be probable, though here, as in everything else, we must say, "if the Lord will, we shall live and do this or that." I will add one word. I agree cordially with Dr. Byrth that the Alliance has made us all better; or, if not, I for one have very little hope of being saved. I must be about as hardened as Pharoah's lieutenant. I think, however, I am not in that state. If I ever knew a glow of Christian love, finding the sweetest exaltation in the deepest humiliation at the foot of the cross, I feel that glow in the mingling of Christian thoughts and feelings together; and I not only realised it at the time, but I go home to remember and luxuriate in the recollection of those scenes as long as I live. (Cheers.) I cannot end without saying how much I desiderate one beloved brother — one who deserves a tribute, a tear, and a prayer, one of whom I can speak, because he is absent, as I would speak of many others, were they absent likewise. I mean our dear friend Mr. Bevan. (Hear, and cheers.) I never heard of that brother before. I saw him first near Sir Culling Smith, at his secretary duties. I watched him. I observed his assiduities, his fidelity, his serviceableness, his modesty, his sweetness, his comfortable influences of every sort; and, Sir, he was more certainly there than even the Chairman, from first to last. And his brethren told me, what his own modesty prevented him telling us himself, that his toils there were only the end of other toils in which he had already fatigued a railway competition. (Cheers and laughter.) I mention him the rather because he is the type of others, whose presence here prevents me saying the same things of them. My heart has been often, and is now, in a glow of love to brother Bevan, of whom I shall carry with me the most affectionate remembrance; and I hope it will please God to raise him from that bed where, for the work of Christ, he was sick nigh unto death, that you may not have sorrow upon sorrow by losing his services in Liverpool. (Hear.) Well, I recollect that the Reformer's ship—the ship that was quartered upon their arms—a glorious ship, with heaven's breezes curling its canvas, and a noble Palinurus at the helm—had this motto upon its flag,

"Sunt tristitiæ mixtæ serenis."

With the bright and balmy sunshine with which we have been favoured, there have also been some slight storms. In the midst of much to rejoice in, we have something to weep over. I feel bound to allude to our differences as well as to our agreement. They are all included under one word—slavery. (Hear.) I do not think that on this subject any one of us has received a single new idea by our visit to England. Whatever you, in this country, may understand of the question in the abstract, we understand it in the concrete. We have studied it on our knees, with our Bibles before us, and with a sincere desire to do our duty. And when I look at the gush of pious humanity that has been poured forth with respect to it, do I regret it? God forbid. I do not see how you, as Englishmen, could be worthy of your birthright as freemen, and worthy of a better freedom than King John and Magna Charta gave you, unless you hated slavery. (Hear, hear, and applause.) But my great desire is that you should understand it. You may know a great deal about its general history, but not about its bearing in America. My great grandfather settled it, so far as he was concerned, by an act of conscience, when he set all his slaves free, long before Wilberforce spoke a word upon the subject. (Loud cheers.) My father and mother taught me the doctrine inculcated by that example. (Hear.) But the question is, what are the best means that Christians can use for the attainment of that great end which all philanthropists desire,—the removal of slavery from every country of the world? This is the whole question. We ought not to do evil that good may come. If any of you should doubt this, I tell you I would rather die than doubt it for a month. It was the imputation of such a doctrine, thrown out by the slanderers of the apostles, that called forth that fell anathema, "Whose damnation is just." In his eternal life-time God never did evil that good might come.

"Who noble ends by noble means attains,
Or, failing, smiles in exile or in chains;
Like good Aurelius let him reign, or bleed
Like Socrates, that man is great indeed."

Some persons have a way of doing these things that we cannot unite in. I once united in it, and wrote some things in my whole-hearted sincerity in favour of it. But I could not stay there. Not that I changed

my principles—I never, believe me, changed my principles—(cheers)—except from strength to strength. If I am not the friend of the black man and the red man, as well as the white and the tawny and the brown, I am not a friend of Christ, who died for all men. Let me draw your attention, however, to the facts of the case. Fifteen states at the north, out of thirty composing the union, are free at this moment; and all the changes of public opinion in the States have been forward, forward, forward, in favour of freedom. Did you ever hear of the chariot of the sun rolling backward? You will hear that before you hear of a free state in America becoming a slave-state. But you have heard little indeed if you have not heard of slave-states becoming free. (Hear.) I believe the state of Kentucky itself—and I am not alone in the belief—would have been free at this moment, had it not been for some most unscrupulous, uncompromising, abusive, exasperating influences, which made the masters mad where they ought to have been persuaded and convinced. Our public men are but men, though assembled in a council chamber. They said, Let us call a convention, and make freedom and Kentucky commensurate. They did call a convention, and, after much debate, their votes were as sixty-eight to sixty-seven against the proposition. (Hear, hear.) They never said they meant to eternise slavery; only that, in the existing crisis, with the exasperated feeling that prevailed, the experiment would be too dangerous, and they must put it off. They made the attempt a second time, and with precisely the same result. At present the anti-slavery spirit of the States has determined that slavery shall not last. It is so in Missouri; it is so in Western Virginia, and will be so in all Virginia ultimately; it is so in Maryland and Delaware, where the public sentiment against slavery is tremendous, and rapidly on the increase. It is almost impossible to moot the question in some of the States, on account of the laws passed, it should be remembered, under the sanction of the British King, and which still remain a dishonour, though a sleeping dishonour, on the statute book. In Maryland it has been ascertained, that the amount of property—for I must use the word, however much I detest it—comprised in bones and sinews, which has been set free, has, in the aggregate, and I think within sixty years, amounted to more than the British Parliament voted, when they made their colonial dependencies free. (Hear, and loud cheers.) If the aggregate of what has been done in all the States, where the practicability of emancipation exists, were spread before you, I am sure it would astonish you. What is the problem, then, for us to work out? It is to conciliate the masters of the slaves by kind arguments, or kind words and hard arguments, if you please. By so doing, we may hope to succeed. But if they are to be made angry, we know it is impracticable. The wisest men that have thought and written upon this subject, have said that there are but two ways in which it is possible—either by moral means, reaching the heart and enlightening the minds—the means, as Mr. Kirk said at the temperance meeting in London, of light, love, and prayer—or the means of bloodshed. (Hear, and cheers.) Now, measures, the tendency of which is high treason against the United States—measures, the tendency of which is to create civil war, we feel to be as much opposed to the interests of the slaves as to those of Christ and conscience. (Applause.) Have we read in vain the history of your border wars, before North Britain and South Britain were one Britain? Have we forgotten the horrid carnage of Flodden Field, or the miseries of Chevy Chase? Have we forgotten the annals of the fifteenth century—its annals of blood—when the contest was between a rose that was red and a rose that was white—when

Long years of havoc urged their destined course,
And thro' the kindred squadrons mowed their way?

The horrors that would be witnessed, the awful deluge of blood that would fatten the fields of America, were civil war to break out there, would make the bloodiest scene in English history shrink into insignificance. (Hear, hear.) And when the arch of our union falls, we believe the hope of the black man will be crushed beneath it. Only create a war in America, where the masters have all the arsenals and all the forces at their command, while the coloured population are destitute of a single warlike implement, and what do you do? You array masses of poor helpless blacks, to serve as targets for an enriated soldiery. (Applause.)

(Much cheering.) Sir, we believe the time has come when men who manage the affairs of different nations must shed ink and not blood—must use the pen and not the sword. (Loud cheers.) They must tell a man, even though he be a slaveholder, "I do not wish to ascribe to you the worst motives, but I would not be in your place for a thousand worlds: I am willing to hear what you have to say for yourself, and prepared calmly to reason with you." Then they would find that the soft word breaketh the bone, and the man would go home and say he was sorry for it. I will tell you an anecdote that will bring this point more forcibly home to you. Dr. Skinner, of North Carolina, the son of a slaveholder and the brother of a slaveholder, but himself a hater of slavery ever since he knew Christ, went to see his friends last spring was a year, and he took Dr. Bushnell with him, who had lately been on a mission to Rome. Dr. Skinner's relation, who is familiarly called Joe Skinner, never trades in slaves. There are some who do, and that is an abomination which heaven and earth abhor together. He cares for the souls of his slaves; he provides them with the means of grace, while hundreds and thousands defy the laws, and not a man dares to bring them before the magistrate. He does this; and when Dr. Bushnell saw his plantations he said, "You take great care of your negroes, but are you going to take care of them for ever?" "Do you dislike it?" was the reply. "Indeed I do," said the doctor; "for God's image carved in ebony is as dear to him as when it is blanched in human whiteness, and he can make us all of one colour." The planter rejoined, "I feel my situation more than you do, and I will make you this offer: I will give you the whole of them this moment. I will have the law process made out, and you shall be placed in the relation (which must be so desirable to one who, like you, hates lucre and loves men) of doing with them what you please." Dr. Bushnell was a little staggered in his philanthropy, as any of you would have been, my dear friends, take my word for it. (Cheers.) He did not know what to do. He asked more questions; and the more he asked, the higher his harp was hung upon the willows, and, after giving some advice, he declined and went away. There are difficulties, great difficulties about this question. But they may be met. We don't believe that slavery is to be eternal any more than we believe that the apostles ordained it. We can enlighten and purify public sentiment. We can teach the slave-holders lessons in political economy which will address their very selfishness, as we teach them truths which address their very consciences. We have requested them to sail down in

one of our steam-boats from Pittsburg to Cincinnati, and from Cincinnati to the mouth of the Ohio, a course of 3,000 miles, with the freshness and fertility of freedom on the one side, and the scath of slavery on the other. There is not a man out of the 10,000 who weekly pass along those shores who does not feel the difference. And much is the cause of freedom indebted to the able advocacy of Cassius M. Clay, who is constantly putting forth economical demonstrations, as well as appeals to the feelings, showing to the Proprietors that they are but elaborating their own meanness, poverty, and ruin so long as they keep slaves upon their estates. (Loud cheers.) These causes are working, and working powerfully; so powerfully, that I believe the time will come when there will not be slavery in Texas. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) If you cannot observe these things for yourselves, you may balance character and ascertain the respectability of witnesses. The men who came from the other side of the Atlantic to attend the Evangelical Alliance belonged to twelve or thirteen different religious denominations, and without any concert they all voted one way. Some have said we are pro-slavery in the Alliance. I say it is a lie. And if the Reverend Mr. Clarke, who comes from Capitol-hill, and who was too late for the Alliance, having been virtually shipwrecked—if he were here, I would ask him to rise and tell you the truth. He said at Manchester, "What the Alliance did on the subject of slavery has my most cordial and uncompromising approbation." This is the testimony of a man who belongs to them, who has felt the iron in his soul—who preaches to a large congregation, one-third of whom belong to that class of whom it may be truly said *dedecus non tutamen*, they are the dishonour instead of the defence of the capitol. In this Alliance I have heard no man dare to do a thing so unchristian, so absurd, and so foolish as to advocate slavery for a moment—unless I have advocated it here this morning; and if I have judge ye. (Much applause.) The question is, shall we make bad worse? Shall we do evil, that good may come? Or shall we, like wise men, seek good ends by good means? The influence of the Evangelical Alliance in America will be most powerful and happy for this purpose. (Hear, hear.) And now I am about to bid you farewell. We expect to-morrow to be on the Atlantic, with an increased affection for Great Britain and for the Christians of Great Britain. I live in New York, whose motto is "Excelsior," which means, she is good, and intends to be better. I believe you will not only do good, but get good by coming there. There is no fear of your contracting worse opinions with regard to slavery. I have eight hundred communicants in my church, and not a slave-holder amongst them. There are blacks as well as whites and both sit down together; if they did not I would not administer the ordinance. (Great applause.) I ask you, then, to pray for us. Pray, while we sail on God's great ocean, that we may come to our beloved homes. I know, without esteeming your hospitality the less, that each man will say, "Home, sweet home; it is the place of places while he lives away from his eternal home in heaven. I have a beloved people where I live, and I desire to go home and serve them in the ministry till I die" The effect of this Alliance in America, when we tell them of your sentiments and what you have done, will be to stir up kindred feelings, which will produce the happiest results to both countries. I think this and the public missionary breakfast at Birmingham are some of the sweetest types of the communion we shall enjoy in that final banquet of the just, when, from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, they shall come together with one heart, one mind, and one song, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God. The blessing of God our Saviour rest upon you. May his presence enlighten you; and, if we never meet again on earth,—not because I do not desire it, but I have thought that fifty-three years of age, and the duties I have to perform, will perhaps be enough to keep me at home for the remainder of my days,—I hope to meet you in heaven, where we shall perfectly understand each other, and be happy and holy for ever in the presence of Christ.—The rev. gentleman sat down amidst enthusiastic and long-continued applause.

The Chairman announced, that, as the morning was so far advanced, and as their American friends had many preparations to make preparatory to their voyage, which would necessarily occupy much of the intervening time, he would call upon the assembly to conclude the business of the meeting, by joining together in a hymn.

The Rev. Geo. Osborn then offered up a prayer of thanksgiving, after which

Dr. Cox again came forward and said: I mentioned the name of our brother, the Rev. Mr. Clarke, who promised to be here, and I wish to tell you of one of his philanthropical objects. He is a brother Christian, greatly loved, and when he comes to Brooklyn I will invite him to my pulpit and to my table, though he is a Methodist and I am a Presbyterian. His church is at Capitol-hill, and right in sight of the American Congress, and in sight of the President's white house, and where Mrs. Polk, our queen—(laughter)—frequently goes. If you would erect a monument on Capitol-hill in commemoration of the best wishes of Great Britain towards the slaves of America, I say you should give something towards re building his chapel. I will promise you I will tell them who did it, and for what, if he asks me to go and preach there. (Cheers.)

The company then retired at about twelve o'clock, highly pleased with the proceedings of the morning.

A meeting to advance the objects of this body was held in the county hall, Aylesbury, on Tuesday evening last. Sir C. E. Smith, bart., in the chair. Present—the Rev. Lord W. Russell; Rev. Messrs. E. Bickersteth; O. Clarke; E. Adey, of Leighton Buzzard; Josiah Bull, of Newport Pagnell; Gates, of Aylesbury; and Wicherley, of Tring, &c., &c. After devotional exercises, the Chairman briefly stated the objects of the Alliance, and defended the conduct of that body in confining itself to abstract principles.

Mr. Gibbs, of Aylesbury, requested permission to put questions regarding the proceedings of the Alliance.

The Chairman replied, he would allow questions to be put, but would not suffer any argument upon them.

The Rev. Mr. Rowton then addressed the meeting in favour of the Alliance.

The Rev. Owen Clarke then followed, who expatiated upon the advantages of Christian union, and expressed his satisfaction at the opportunity he had enjoyed of associating with clergymen of the Church of England; and believed, if his Dissenting brethren had similar opportunities, they would entertain an opinion different from that which some of them at present entertained. The Alliance, in its operations, could remove prejudices on all sides.

Several letters of apology were read from distin-

guished foreigners and others, unable to attend.

Rev. E. Bickersteth entered at some length into the general principles of the Society, and answered various objections which had been urged against the Alliance; and stated, that he honoured the motives of many of those who objected. Englishmen loved downright honesty—they hated a hollow union, and he hoped the Alliance would stand upon the highest and most holy principles. He vindicated the principles which excluded Quakers from the Alliance, and read a letter from Joseph J. Gurney, Esq., approving of the Alliance, which that gentleman, after expressing his interest in the proceedings of the Alliance, heartily wished it well in its endeavour to promote the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. On the subject of the admission of involuntary slave-holders into the Alliance, he would say, that the American brethren were unanimous in their condemnation of the sin of slavery, and the giving up of the resolution, agreed to, had rendered it more difficult for slave-holders to obtain admission into the Alliance. The rev. gentleman concluded a long and deeply interesting address amidst the applause of the meeting.

Mr. Gibbs then inquired, how, with the love for the Society of Friends which they had just expressed, they could reject them, and yet receive slave-holders into their Union.

Mr. Bickersteth stated, that for harmonious action together it was necessary to have certain principles in order to promote evangelical Protestantism, withstand infidelity, Popery, and profaneness. With regard to slaveholders, none could be received as members of the Alliance without the consent of all the districts of England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Germany, France and other countries.

Mr. Gibbs reiterated his question, why they should receive the dealers in the flesh, blood, and souls of their fellow-creatures?

The Chairman stated, that they did not form principles or doctrines in order to meet; but they met to examine the principles which they held in common. Having met and prayed together, they inquired what were the principles they held in common, coupling that inquiry with the assertion, that they should not pretend to be the Christian church. "With reference to slavery," said the hon. baronet, "permit me to allude to a fact which has been most unjustly concealed from the public attention. I have a right to make reference to that unjust concealment. In a newspaper which thought itself justified in inviting members of the Conference to violate an honourable pledge—in a newspaper which engaged somebody—thank God, I do not know who it was—to give a report to the public of confidential proceedings—in that newspaper which professed to give daily a report of the whole of our proceedings—having undertaken to do so, one whole day's proceedings were dishonestly suppressed. (Hear.) I say, to the credit of the English Press, that I do not believe there is another newspaper in the kingdom which is capable of such a dishonest action. (Cries of "Name, name.") On Monday, when our difficulties were thickening upon us, when it was perceived that the resolution which had been passed on Saturday night would involve our American brethren in certain difficulties, we met under considerable apprehension, and those apprehensions and anxieties were strongly expressed in the report of the newspaper I have referred to. It was stated that the matter was re-committed to a fresh Committee of Inquiry. It was stated that we adjourned on Monday night in a state of anxiety, and from Monday night, the very next word that occurs in the report, is the report of the proceedings on Wednesday morning. On Tuesday the whole thing was amicably settled, every difference was removed, and Mr. Howard Hinton, the Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, was the mover of the arrangement which conciliated us all. (Cheers.) I appeal here to the honest-minded part of Englishmen, whether they approve of the Alliance or not? Whether it is not a thing disgraceful to the Press, that in a matter involving the honesty of character of hundreds and thousands, such a fact as that should be suppressed? (Cheers and cries of "Name.") Having repeated the reasons before assigned for the rescinding of the resolution before referred to, the hon. baronet concluded his statement (which was delivered with strong expression of feeling) by saying, "I must say, that if this report goes forth fully to the public, as I am quite sure it will do from the high character of the local Press, it will go far to correct the erroneous impression." (Cheers.)

The Rev. E. Adey, of Leighton Buzzard, then expatiated upon the general principles of the Alliance, which he was sure, under its present constitution, would not admit an abettor of slavery at all. The principles which the Alliance had adopted were those which were held by the largest portion of the Evangelical body in Christendom. They were preached faithfully in every evangelical pulpit, and formed a noble confession of faith.

Mr. Hamilton (amidst considerable applause and disapprobation) appealed to the meeting upon the suppression by the Chairman of all discussion upon the important subjects before them. He repeated the question respecting the non-admission of Quakers, and received substantially the same answer as had been given in the previous part of the meeting. Upon the second point the discussion thus proceeded—

Mr. Hamilton: My next question has reference to slavery. Does the Evangelical Alliance open its doors to those Free Churchmen of Scotland, who go into slaveholding states, and hold communion with those who deal in the blood of our fellow creatures, and taking money produced from the traffic in that blood? (Loud cheers; interruption and cries of "Go on, go on;" "Bravo, bravo.")

Mr. Campbell: Really, Mr. Chairman, this is not a proper question to be put.

The Chairman: Oh, yes; I should like to hear him out.

Mr. Hamilton: I say, Sir, does the Evangelical Alliance open its doors to those Free Churchmen in Scotland who go to the slave-holding States in America, and who participate in communion with slave-holding churches, and partake of money derived from the traffic in human blood for the purpose of perpetuating the doctrines and ordinances of the Lord Jesus Christ? (Loud cheers.)

The Chairman: The answer to that question is very brief. The Evangelical Alliance opens its doors to those who being one in spirit, and one in doctrine, are willing to be one in affection and action. (Hear.) I believe there are many conscientious Christians who could not join in fellowship with persons who are owners of slaves. We believe that there are many other conscientious Christians who could join in fellowship with those who are owners in slaves. It was only last week that one of the most Christian men in London—a member of the Evangelical Alliance——and one of its most useful members too—who came to me and stated this case. He said, "I am a member and director of a Brazilian Mining Company. That Brazilian Mining Company uses the only labour which is to be found in Brazil; we are able only to employ the labour of slaves; in fact, we are slave-owners; but

I have persuaded my brother directors to send out Christian missionaries to instruct those slaves. Though they are legal slaves morally, we treat them as freemen. We do what we can to bring them to the knowledge of Christ. We desire to see them well off. We wish to see those men set free, and made freemen like ourselves; in the meantime, we endeavour to make them Christians. Already, our example has had a most beneficial effect, and the treatment of slaves through all the provinces of Brazil has been materially ameliorated by our conduct. Sir," said he, " do you think, under those circumstances, I am under any obligation, or that I ought, as a Christian, to give up my connexion with the Company ?" (Loud cries of " Question, question," " Order, order," and great confusion.)

Mr. Campbell: I really, Sir, must rise to order. If the Chairman is to be interrupted in this way, there really will be an end to all order.

The Chairman: I shall answer that part of the question which relates to the inclusion in the Evangelical Alliance of members of a particular denomination who are stated to have held communion with slaveholders. I do not like, upon occasions like this, that matters shall be made personal; therefore, instead of taking the particular case of the members of the Church of Scotland, I have put a general case. I have mentioned a particular instance which came under my own knowledge; and I now say, that, sooner than say I will not hold communion with that Brazilian Mining Company's member, whom I believe to be one of the best men in London, I should be ashamed of myself if I did not sooner resign my situation as a member of the Evangelical Alliance. (" Oh, oh!" " Hear, hear.") There are cases in which individuals are compelled, in spite of themselves, to be unwilling participators in slavery. (Loud cries of " No, no," " Horrible," and great confusion.) Well, if that is the opinion of the three or four persons at the bottom of the hall, I am quite sure that is not the opinion of the Christian public. They believe men may be Christians, and yet unhappily in spite of themselves connected with slavery. (Loud cries of " No, no," " Shame, shame," " Horrible.") I believe there is not, among the many members of the Church of Scotland connected with the Alliance, one single individual who is not most earnest in denouncing slavery, and who would not take every practical means of getting rid of it.

Mr. Hamilton: No, no.

The Chairman: Well, I suppose you know the members of the Evangelical Alliance better than I do. I am speaking of fact, and I think it is not courteous to contradict me when stating that fact. I think you cannot have been accustomed to public meetings to interrupt in the way you have done. (Hear.) I think it due to myself to state that. I state it as a fact, that the members of the Evangelical Alliance are ready and desirous for some united movement, by which, if possible, the curse of slavery may be obliterated from existence. (Hear.) I have now great pleasure in calling upon the Rev. Mr. Clarke, a minister from the United States, himself a coloured man, and minister of a congregation of which one-third are slaves, and the whole of whom are coloured, and who, at the expense of these slaves and coloured people, is sent over to this country.

The Rev. M. M. Clarke then very briefly addressed the meeting, stating the advantages which he had derived personally from the establishment of the Alliance; and expressing—although that expression might prevent his return to America, and cause his expatriation from his native country — his utter detestation of American slavery in all its shapes and forms. He denied that he had ever expressed himself in favour of that system.

Lord Wriothesley Russell then addressed the meeting in a most earnest and affectionate speech upon the advantages of Christian union; and in the course of his address illustrated the importance of such Christian feelings by a quotation from an unpublished letter written by Richard Baxter to an ancestor of his (Lord W. Russell's), consoling with him upon the loss of his lady.

Mr. Hamilton then moved the thanks of the meeting to the Chairman, whose conduct upon that somewhat trying occasion he considered had evinced more courage and chivalry than had been displayed by Sir E. N. Buxton, in a similar position at Norwich. As discussion had not been permitted upon the subject of slavery that evening, he begged to announce that the Anti-slavery League would hold a meeting in the same hall in a few days, when the whole proceedings of the Alliance would be reviewed.

The motion having been seconded by the Secretary, was carried unanimously.

The Chairman, in returning thanks, defended Sir E. N. Buxton, who was not, at the time alluded to, a member of the Alliance, and did not so fully understand its principles.

The proceedings of the meeting were then terminated with singing and benediction.

Patriot Oct 1. 1846.

DEATH OF THOMAS CLARKSON.

Our present Number will announce to our readers the decease of that truly illustrious philanthropist, the venerable Thomas Clarkson, who expired at his residence, Playford-hall, near Ipswich, on Saturday last, in the eighty-seventh year of his age. For a considerable time his bodily infirmities had been increasing upon him so as to incapacitate him for any active exertion, but his spirit burned bright to the last, and he continued to take an undiminished interest in the great object to which, with an heroic singleness of purpose and unwearied perseverance, he had consecrated all his energies. The prolongation of his life, in honour and in the enjoyment of his faculties, to so advanced an age, seems like a special mark of Providential favour, affording a striking illustration of the declaration, that " the hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness." Our venerated friend has had, indeed, to sustain the penalties of survivorship, in seeing, one after another, his early coadjutors and most endeared fellow-labourers in the cause of Abolition gathered to their rest. And it might almost appear that he had outlived the Anti-slavery cause itself. At all events, he must have felt that his work was done. His removal has taken place at a critical moment, when a totally new policy has been entered upon by Government in reference to slaveholding States, which must issue either in the con-

summation of the great object of his persevering exertions, or in the most cruel frustration of his fondest wishes. We know not whether his hopes or his fears preponderated; but he must have felt that the tide of public opinion had set in too strongly in favour of Free-trade, to allow of any availing opposition to the abolition of restrictive duties. At the same time, had his life been protracted, he would have found himself called upon to affix his name to the melancholy avowal, after the costly and laborious efforts of successive Administrations during the last forty years to suppress the inhuman traffic in slaves, "that, so long as Slavery exists, there is no reasonable prospect of the annihilation of the Slave-trade, and of extinguishing the sale and barter of human beings." It may be so; and the venerable philanthropist may have concurred in the opinion entertained by the Anti-slavery Society, that an armed force is both incompetent to suppress the trade, and an illegitimate mode of attempting it. We confess, that, while fully alive to the futility of the present system, we are not prepared to adopt the conclusion, that all coercive restrictions upon the African piracy ought to be abandoned. We cannot bring ourselves to wish to see the Slave-trade legalized by the British Government, and its abolition proclaimed to all the world to have been worse than a failure. But, if it be so, it were time for the veteran philanthropists to retire from the field.

Not that we have ever imagined that Slavery could be extinguished by punishing the Slave-trader, any more than the consumption of contraband articles can be stopped by punishing the smuggler. We believe that Slavery can be destroyed only by destroying the profits of slave-labour. We view without apprehension the abandonment of fiscal restrictions upon Slave-labour produce; and, in the downfall of the West India Monopoly, we think we see the approaching consummation of the object for which Clarkson laboured and Wilberforce pleaded, in association with a noble band of honoured philanthropists, of whom but few indeed are the survivors.

Patriot Oct 1. 1846.

LAST THOUGHTS OF THOMAS CLARKSON ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PATRIOT.

Sir,—On the 20th of last month, I accompanied William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass, on a visit to Mr. Clarkson, at Playford-hall. He gave us a most affectionate reception. Though he was, at the time, very feeble in body, his mind evinced an extraordinary degree of activity, and a consideration of his physical weakness alone prevented us from conversing with him at much greater length.

On parting with us, he placed in the hands of Mr. Garrison and myself, the accompanying paper, saying, it contained his last and most mature thoughts on the subject of American Slavery, and especially on the subject of a dissolution of "the Union." He gave us a strict charge to make his views known, whenever we thought their publication would be useful; adding, that he hoped to send us a few more pages in the course of the following week.

n the following week, (about the 25th of August), we received a note from Mr. Clarkson, saying he was "*very ill*"—that we must consider the paper as concluded—and adding, "I think this will be the last note I shall ever write."

The present seems a suitable moment for me to say, that Mr. Clarkson expressed his entire approbation of the Anti-slavery course of Mr. Garrison, and especially of his views respecting "No union with slaveholders," and "The dissolution of the union."

I remain, &c.,
GEORGE THOMPSON.

6, Waterloo-place, Sept. 30, 1846.

HINTS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THE EVENT OF A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

The dissensions between the inhabitants of the Northern and Southern States of America, which have existed so many years on the subject of negro slavery, and which the American newspapers have recently increased by the cry of "No Union with Slaveholders," have now become so general, that it seems to me, that, should they spread much further, it will be impossible for the two to continue to live much longer under the same Government, without a rupture of some sort, more or less friendly. I presume, that if such a great event were to take place, it might possibly be effected by mutual agreement, and in an amicable manner. I see no reason why any serious disturbances or outrage need follow. People, in general, might keep their present houses, lands, property, trades, and occupations. The only difference would be, that they would live under new laws. I feel myself greatly interested in this subject, and I wish that I was better acquainted than I am with the internal organisation and policy of the United States, that I might enter more fully into the vast field of discussion which the dissolution of the union opens; and so be useful in recommending a peaceful separation. But I have not the requisite knowledge for an ample discussion. Still, as a few thoughts have passed in my mind on the subject, I see no reason why I should not bring them forward. Perhaps one or more new ideas may be started by them, and some of my readers may possibly be set to work to consider them, and to examine if they are true. But if they should be found to be worthless, they will be immediately rejected, and I shall only have lost my labour.

A number of American gentlemen were in London some time ago—gentlemen of high character, both for intelligence and probity. They all called upon me, and I took the opportunity of conversing with them on the subject to which these pages relate. And here I may state, at once, that much of the information which I have now to give, is derived from this quarter.

Surgeon [illegible]

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.—We are glad to perceive by an advertisement, that the long anticipated visit of Fredk. Douglass, the Fugitive Slave, from Maryland, is likely to take place. Mr. Douglass will be accompanied to Bristol by Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Esq., of Boston, the President of the American Anti-Slavery Society. This gentleman is the originator of the great abolition movement now going on in America, and by his noble sacrifices, and devotion to this great cause, has obtained a name which will secure respect and honour in America long after those of her heroes and senators are forgotten. An anti-slavery league has just been formed in London with reference to American slavery, the nature of which will be explained by Mr. Garrison.

[illegible] Lord Bishop returned to Stapleton Palace a[illegible]

tried to make himself as diminutive as possibl
writhed his body about so as to slip away throu
crowd; but he could not raise his eyes, withou
ing a storm gathering against him. He tried
method of appearing a stranger who, passing the
chance, had found himself entangled in the c
like a bit of straw in the ice; and encountering
face to face, who looked at him fixedly with a
terrible countenance than the others, he, comp
his face to a smile, with a look of great simp
demanded, "What is all this stir?"

Roebling, July 28 [illegible]

Dear Newell

The firm took it into their head to have a Pow-Wow this morning so I lost my trip to Essex County, which the weather was also rather unfavorable for. I dined with Miss Garland & Miss Weston, dat whole in the parlor in which I spent many a pleasant evening with Mary, ten years ago & came home about 3 o'clk to find your letter & its enclosures. It is a pity the letter from Mrs Phillips did not come to light in time for the book. Father's 1846 letter is familiar to me & I remember weighing in my mind, when I sent it to you, whether it had better be quoted. On the whole, I thought not, then, & I am rather inclined to think so still, but I will see how it strikes Wm & Ellie, & report later. I have been hoping to get them to read or listen to my 1851 & 1852 chapters, before sending them to you, but they have not found the time yet, & I don't think I shall

[illegible] much larger. It is quite as well that I have returned the [illegible] [illegible] large [illegible], as I have had several notes to add as the result of what I found in travelling through 1853. The latter lacks only a brief account of the Decade Meeting to complete it, and that I hope to write to-night. The next chapter will begin with Mother's paralysis, which happened, as you will remember, at the end of December.

I enclose the full extract from Lovell, of which you will find only the last paragraph serviceable. The scrap-book of G.T.'s I think I had better express to you this week, whether the mss. chapters 1861 - 1863 go with it or not. It not only contains the reports of the G.T. & W.R.G. & F.D. meetings of 1846, but the full document of Clarkson's on the American Union, of which I carelessly destroyed the original, & which I failed to find printed in the Liberator. See pp. 67, 72, & p. 72 of the scrap-book, which, by the way, ends in April, 1847.

It is very pleasant to hear of Richard & Christy Atwater's visit to the Park. I must hear Kate's imitation of R. M. A. sometime. — Belle is much better to-day. But is in Watertown with his parents.

The first question which I put to the parties referred to, was, whether, in case it should be determined, after a national discussion, that the union should be continued, and slavery with it, any of the abolitionists would cease to reside in the United States, or whether they would go off to another country. I told them plainly, that I knew, with respect to myself, that my feelings would never allow me to live in the United States permanently, with any comfort, under such circumstances;—that I could not bear to see fugitive slaves, chained together, passing my door in their way to be returned to a cruel and enraged master; nor to hear reports, every now and then floating about, of the cruel punishment of these wretched people;—that I should be continually seeing or hearing something which would wound my feelings;—in fact, that living in a slave country would be, to take away from me the pleasure of life, if not to embitter it; and therefore, if slavery were fixed upon, as a permanent institution in the land, no temptation which could be held out to me would be sufficient to induce me to remain in it as my place of abode. The gentlemen I have mentioned informed me, that "ideas similar to my own had existed in the minds of a few; but that there were great difficulties in the way,—such as that of removing, and of not knowing where to go for the best; but that these had of late been greatly lessened by the altered state of things. There was now a hope that the abolition of slavery would take place in a very few years. The time was fast approaching, when the friends of liberty would be more numerous than its enemies; and then, a Government depending entirely upon popular opinion, as the American Government did, must yield. During the last few years, Anti-Slavery publications, said they, have been circulated in almost every State belonging to the Union, and have produced a wonderful change. The Anti-Slavery cause may be said, during these years, not to have walked, but to have galloped through the land. So extensive has been the agitation of this question, that there has been scarcely a house in which conversation has not taken place on the subject."

"The farmers, and other inhabitants of the interior of the country, it appears, were ignorant of the foul misdeeds, the tyrannical and horrible conduct of the southern planters towards their slaves—deeds which were going on in their own land; but their eyes have been opened, and hatred to slavery, more or less earnest, has been the result; and this hatred has been increasing, so that the tide has, in many parts, already been turned in favour of abolition. The planters themselves, also, in consequence of this wide-spread agitation of the subject, have been forced to consider it most attentively, as regards their own interest, and several of them have come to the conclusion, that slavery is an unwise system compared with that of free labour, and that there must be some alteration, though they know not what to substitute in its place. Add to this, that there is an altered tone in the language of Members of Congress, when speaking of Abolitionists, or whenever the subject of emancipation comes to be discussed in the Legislature. All these circumstances make us indulge the hope that the days of slavery are numbered."

I told these gentlemen that I was highly gratified with the latter part of the information given me by them—that there were *a few good men* who had once thought of leaving the United States, in case it were resolved upon that slavery should continue, and be made a permanent institution. But though I thought that the inhuman treatment of their poor oppressed fellow citizens, and its iniquity, afforded good ground for such a thought among persons in affluence, yet a much stronger motive, I apprehended, existed with family men, to think in the same manner. This was, the difficulty of bringing up young men in a land of SLAVERY without the taint of infidelity, which would consign many souls to eternal ruin. I did not mean to say, that there was no true religion in America; I knew on the contrary that thousands who professed to be real Christians, were Christians indeed, and went as far in their practice as any people in any part of the world; but I did mean to say that slavery had given birth to notions and opinions which led to downright atheism, and that, wherever it had spread, it had generated the most baneful notions, and that, in consequence of the constant intercourse of planters and their agents with others, the infection had spread into other states and countries, (before healthy) though far distant from the sea of pollution, which slavery had introduced into the Southern United States. That these baneful effects were seen first among the planters and their agents in their more cruel and wicked treatment of their slaves; which treatment recoiled upon themselves, by lowering the standard of their morals. They were seen next, in the neighbourhood of the plantations where these examples first appeared. From that time infidelity took root and grew. The very first symptom of a fatal tendency was, that the Bible account of the creation was false; that God had not created man as described there; but that there were different races of men, of which the negro race was one, and that this race was a very inferior link in the chain of creation, approaching nearly to the brute; and, therefore, that they might consider the black man, and treat him, as one of the brute species, and class him with property, such as cattle and sheep, and even with inanimate things such as chairs and other dead matter, and with whatever was saleable. Now all these wicked notions originated with the planters. Not that the Bible ever held out anything from which such perverse sentiments could be inferred; but because the planters, in justification of their own conduct, which they knew to be inexcusable, and being ignorant themselves, set the clergy to work, thus making them prostitute their own consciences, to show that the Scriptures had been misunderstood, and, by a perversion of texts, that the holy men, called the Patriarchs were the inventors or founders of slavery; and that it was, therefore, an institution which met with the approbation of God. Slavery then built upon these false principles, and was patronised by the clergymen of the country. It then took a deep root, and spread, and began to be looked upon as an ordinary custom, not calling for animadversion. It originated then with the planters, upon this principle, and found its way into their respective neighbourhoods, and this among men who were not the holders of slaves. The fatal notion that the Bible account of the creation was false, was spread both by the planters and their agents wherever they travelled, and these made a point of defending slavery, upon this principle, in all their intercourse with the inhabitants of the free or Northern States, and of glossing over the horrors of the slave system, to make it palatable. Nor was this intercourse of trifling extent, when we consider the intermarriages, and the great commercial connexions, between the two classes of States. Hence, there was a great falling off in religious vitality, in, I believe, all the States of the Union; so that religion began to consist with too many people in expediency; and, I believe,

that this is pretty much the state of things at the present day. Now, it may be asked, can any substantial proof, so as to admit of no contradiction, be given of their want of religious principle in that country, besides my own assertion? There can; and not from one or two solitary instances, but perhaps a thousand and more. Two or three years ago there were thousands, and many even in the more virtuous northern states, who would not pay their legal public debts. How much, in these people, must the moral sense have been lowered and debased; not in individuals only, but in multitudes, who could brave the shame of denying their own legal obligations. All Europe came to the knowledge of these transactions, and reprobated them in almost all the coffee-houses on the Continent; so that no people ever stood so low among the civilised nations of the earth; and I believe, that if slavery should continue a few years longer, and its genuine offspring, infidelity, accompany it, as it has hitherto invariably done, I doubt whether the American people will not be put down in our maps as a semi barbarian people! Neither can the evil be corrected, but by the total abolition of slavery. The little religion which there is in America is good; but perhaps no less than a third of the clergy have caught the contagion of the pro slavery mania, and are not abolitionists. Again, the laity of America, contrary to the Scriptures, have taken upon themselves a domineering despotism over the clergy, so as to have them in complete subjection. Hence the clergy must be silent, if their masters are friends of slavery. Again, thousands and thousands have no opportunity of religious instruction, as to their duty to God and his creatures. In no country in the Christian world are there such immense tracts of land without a single pastor, or where pastors are so little encouraged, or where their stay or residence, for the purpose of reforming the people under their care, is so uncertain; every pastor being liable to be reprimanded and dismissed from his office by the heads of his congregation, with the alternative of getting into some new employ, or of starving. Add to this, that many itinerant preachers wander about the country; men of little or no education, and utterly incapable of explaining the true meaning of the Scriptures; and they are taken in as pastors, for want of a better choice, whose doctrines, however flighty, or contrary to the sober doctrines of the Gospel, are swallowed with avidity by their congregations, as the doctrines of the Christian religion.

Now, is this (a country, in which the very air, if I may so say, is impregnated with infidelity and atheism) a fit country in which to bring up children in the love and fear of God, and in the reverence of the Gospel, so as to count upon their well-doing in this present life, or on their prospects in another? Will there be no contagion from the spread of such sentiments and bad examples? Who can answer for the welfare of his children in such a corrupted population? Who is the wiser man in such a state of things? The man who, seeing the pestilence around him, flies to another country; or the man who remains in it? If the welfare of children be, of all others, the object of deepest solicitude to parents, they cannot make too great a sacrifice for them. It is their duty, if they be family men, and men of fortune, to avail themselves of the means of escaping from the moral pestilence which threatens them. Hence, I think I am justified in believing that this motive for leaving their country, is a much stronger one than that at first mentioned, namely, of getting rid of the cries, and of the reports, of the cruel treatment of those held in toils and bondage.

To this the gentlemen replied, that my account of the great decline of morals in America was but too true, and that all pious men there lamented it; but that people did not like to reveal their sentiments on such a delicate subject, and that believing, as so many of them did, that slavery was doomed to fall in no great length of time, they were silent upon it.

I then asked these gentlemen what would be the great disadvantages of dissolving the Union? Several of the present states, they replied, which belonged to the Union, would be withdrawn from it, and would either become separate free states of themselves, or form themselves into a new free union, for there was to be no union with slaveholders. Now it must be obvious, that a separation from such a great population as the slave states contain, would greatly diminish the strength of the Republic, as a nation: would even threaten her independence, and of course her consequence. Look at the position which she now holds. Consider the length, breadth, and width of the land, belonging to the Union, and what an immense territory presents itself on the map. Consider, again, the number of inhabitants it contains, and its whole population. This extent of country, and this population, under one union, must for ever place America among the first and most powerful nations of the earth, and she must always, while united, assume a commanding attitude. She is only vulnerable in one place, namely, where that inflammable part of her population (her slave population) is located. And here, it it must be confessed, that, if ever a war should break out with any one or more powerful European nations, skilled in the art of war, as most of them are, the mischief done to her might be so great, that she would not recover herself in fifty years. But, besides this, her strength at home, her immense territory and population, give her consequence abroad. They give her a station, a representative station at foreign courts, where she holds a dignified rank. If injustice be done to her citizens, if their rights are invaded by other countries, she can, if her cause be a just one, get redress for such injuries by means of her ambassadors. Whereas, a petty state, comprising a small territory, and a small population, might not be able to afford the expense of such envoys. The diminution, then, of the strength of the republic, by withdrawing such a large population from the union as the slave states contain, is set forth as one of the great disadvantages which would accompany a dissolution. Now, what is meant by the strength of the Union? I cannot conceive (taking the word in a national sense) than that it means anything else than the capability or power of the United States to defend themselves, in case of insult or attack from any other quarter, and that she may bid defiance to the rest of the world. I am sorry for this interpretation, as it may seem to imply that I have no objection to war. I am obliged, therefore, though I detest war, as the greatest evil which ever appeared upon earth, and as utterly at variance with the principles of our religion, to meet these gentlemen on their own ground. That my interpretation of the word strength will be admitted, Captain Marryatt, who was nearly two years in America, with no other view than that of forming his own opinion of that country by actual observation, and who is almost the only writer who has done the Americans justice, considers America to be the weakest of all nations who have any pretensions to call themselves nations, as far as regards the operations of war. "If

you will give her," he says, "a cause of war in which the whole nation will join with enthusiasm, no people will fight better, and there will be no stain upon their valour; but they would do but little in an ordinary cause, in which they took little or no interest. They are an excitable people, and they must be excited to carry a point."

If we were to take this subject into consideration, we should say, at first sight, that the argument of these gentlemen was a fair one, and that it might be true of any other country; but it is less so of America, for the largeness of a territory and its population, does not always constitute its strength. I will suppose one or two cases by way of illustration. Suppose that the Americans were to provoke a war from some cause or other with some one of the most powerful of the European nations: what good would their immense population do them in their present state? Nearly one half of the numerical strength of the country would be lost to them. Twelve or thirteen, out of twenty-six, being slave states, could not spare a hand to assist. See the Report of that noble Convention of American delegates, consisting of the flower of the citizens and patriots of America, assembled from various parts of the Union at Cincinnati, June 11, 1845. "How completely," it says, "are the slave-holding states at the mercy of any invading foe, who will raise the standard of emancipation. In the revolutionary war, according to the secret journals of Congress, South Carolina was unable to make any effectual efforts with her militia, by reason of the great proportion of citizens necessary to remain at home to prevent insurrection among the negroes, and to prevent the desertion of them to the enemy. We need not say, that if the danger of insurrection was then great, it would be tenfold greater now." We cannot help noticing, in this Report to the American public, the words, "the secret Journals of Congress." These words are of no little importance. They show that the Congress was either afraid of letting the people know the true condition of the slaves, or that they could not defend themselves at this crisis. Such, then, is the curse of slavery on America, as it relates to war. But it is of necessity a curse, as it is a bar to improvements of almost every kind. Were a Bill to be brought into Congress, which was manifestly for the welfare of the people, (if there was the least tendency in it to diminish the rigour of slavery,) it would be thrown out. But there is another inference which we may draw from what has been just remarked. Suppose the Slave States, after the dissolution of the Union, were so exasperated with the Free States, (considering them to have been the authors of the separation,) as to resolve to take vengeance upon them in the shape of war; or resolve upon war against them, from any other cause: dare they or could they invade their territory, when they could not get a foot-soldier among their slaves, whom they could trust with arms in their hands? Or, if their slaves were left at home, could they spare their militia to be absent for an indefinite time? They might talk and bluster, but that is all they could do. The citizens, then, of the free states need be under no apprehension of war from the threats of the planters of the South. To talk of injuring them by the invasion of their country, is perfectly ridiculous.

Let us now look at the argument again, but in another point of view. The strength of the Union, it is said, would be impaired by the withdrawal of so many of its present sta[illegible] But how vague is this assertion, after the light which has been just thrown upon the question. Are not those states, which would be withdrawn from the Union, slave states? And has it not been shown, that these states, in consequence of the vigilance necessary to be constantly exercised over the plantation slaves, would be hindered from giving any effectual aid, as to military operations? The free states, therefore, would be quite as strong and powerful in case of a separation, without the slave states, as with them. What is the use of numerical strength, if it cannot be brought into action? The argument, therefore, is without value on this occasion.

But there are many other circumstances to be taken into consideration before we can admit its validity. We know nothing of the measures to be taken to bring about a separation, and much will depend upon the prudence of these for the success or failure of the scheme. I presume that the inhabitants of the North, the authors of the cry "No union with Slaveholders," would take the lead on this occasion, and conduct the change. They would at once see the folly of dividing the land of the whole union, as it exists, into any great number of petty independent states; for such a measure would produce weakness; but of contriving if possible to divide it into as many Unions (several states belonging to each Union,) as would answer the ends of harmony and strength. They, the Northern States, would bring into their Union such and such only as were willing to join them. They would of course have communications by deputations with the leading persons of the free states for this purpose. Can there be a doubt that these, who already see the iniquity of slavery, would join the confederacy of the North?

The Northern and other free states are at this time about equal in number to the slave states; that is, if I recollect rightly, about thirteen to thirteen. But a further addition to the strength of the North is highly probable. A majority of the inhabitants of three or four of the slave states are greatly displeased at seeing the lands cultivated by free labourers all thriving, while their own (cultivated by slaves) are going backwards; and add to this, the stings of conscience, almost bordering on despair, on account of the sin of slaveholding, which frequently compels them to emancipate by will. From one or other, or both of these causes, the population of Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and North Carolina, might be expected to avail themselves of a law of the constitution to demand of Congress to change their appellation, and to be registered or enrolled as free states.

Now, if a dissolution of the Union should ever take place, and if the disposition to become free instead of slave states should continue or increase, the probability is, that three or four new states would come into the new Union, which would consist of seventeen free states instead of thirteen. Will any person, then, persuade me, that the vast extent of territory, larger than any potentate upon earth has, except Russia, would not be sufficiently strong to deter foreigners from attempting insult or aggression? The new Union would have quite as much strength as the old had. It would be equally respected abroad. Would not their ambassadors be received at foreign courts as before? Dare the Powers of Europe refuse to receive their envoys—the representatives of lands greater in extent than the lands of France, Spain, and Portugal put together—and yet receive representatives from petty Princes of Germany, ten of whose dominions might be picked out, which, when put together would not, in point of extent of territory, exceed the single State of New York? With or with-

out the annexation of other states of the Union, all would be well. So much then for the argument of the diminution of the strength of the Republic, in consequence of the dissolution of the Union. I then asked the American gentlemen if they had any other argument to produce, or if they had said all that they meant to say. They answered, the people of America were more attached than any other people in the world to the free political institutions of their country, which nothing could induce them to part with; and some of them had a fear lest the dissolution would sweep them all away. I freely acknowledge that many of the American Institutions are excellent, and greatly superior to those in most other countries; but let not the American people run away with the notion that their legislative system is perfect, or always agreeable either to the principles of humanity, justice, or even freedom or sound policy. Can there be a fouler, or more flagitious, or bloody piece of legislation, than the laws which relate to slavery? Can there be a more unjust and cruel nuisance to society than the continuance of Lynch law? I will not go for a further proof to those writers on America, too many of whom have not done justice to that country in their descriptions, but to sober-minded travellers, who have a due sense of the importance of character, and of being themselves just to others. Captain Marryatt and M. de Toqueville are of this description; and we glean from both, but particularly the latter, who is more diffuse, that the free political institutions of America are yet far from perfect. But if we inquire into the subject further, we may find probabilities next to certainties, by which it can be proved that the people of America ought, nay, must have a better and more perfect Constitution than they have now; and that not only their free political institutions, of which they so much boast, need to be trespassed upon, but greatly improved. Can it be denied, that when the old, or rather the present Union is dissolved, the American Government must still go on, and that the new union, or unions, which succeed, it will have the power of making laws, as at present, each for the state or states which might belong to it? If, then, there should be in the present statute-book, any free political institutions, to which the people are attached on account of their excellencies, the new law-makers would be fools indeed, if they did not retain them. If, again, there were bad laws, which were in any degree injurious to the people, or which had not worked well, would they not be blotted out? Besides this, the new law-makers would have the power of searching antiquity for new laws that were good, and of introducing these and others which their own experience might suggest as useful or wanting. Thus, America might have a legislation, and free political institutions, such as the world never yet saw.

I consider, then, the dissolution of the union, by affording the opportunity of making such a change, among the greatest of blessings, and, in all probability, nothing but a dissolution of the Union could produce such a glorious opportunity. What other event could give America the opportunity of legislating anew, but the dissolution now in question? If this opportunity should be allowed to slip, nothing occurs, within the range of my vision, at present, that could repair it. And now having hinted at the advantages which would arise from the abolition of the old, or rather, as I said before, of the present Union, I feel myself bound to lay some of them before the American public, and they will then judge for themselves, whether they are of sufficient weight to induce them to forward this great measure.

In the first place, I may say, that the new legislators would feel themselves obliged to abolish slavery, and all the bloody laws which relate to slavery, in their respective Unions. This would be, nay, must be, the first fruits of their great measure; for it would be utterly inconsistent in those to retain it, who join in the cry of "no union with slaveholders."

Not finished, but will be finished in a few days.

August 18th, 1846.

Thomas Clarkson's Last Moments.—The *Globe* of last night, publishes extracts from a letter to Mr. Soul, from a clergyman at Playford, containing the following interesting particulars respecting the last moments of this venerable philanthropist:—

He had become seriously worse during the last three weeks, and finally took to his bed on Saturday week. His strength was much enfeebled previously; but, till he was driven to his bed, he gave his mind to matters of public good. The interests and hardships of our mercantile seamen last engaged his feelings. After he was laid on his bed, I do not recollect that he entered upon external matters, but gave his mind much to prayer, and was unwilling to be interrupted in the prayerful course of his thoughts upon the future. He announced that he had made his peace with God, and addressed to a friend, before too weak, what he designed to be, I believe, a definite statement of his views upon the cardinal point of man's hopes, and his own reliance upon it for the future disposal of his soul.

On Thursday evening, Mr. Clarkson subsided into sleep or unconsciousness, during the continuance of which, he did not stir or speak. On Friday evening he roused up, with his physical powers much reduced, so that, as he mentioned some of his attendants by name he could not articulate his wishes for little matters to be done for his ease and comfort. He now spoke with imploring look, and with agitated and clasped hands; he was, however, incapable of receiving or enjoying any attentions; and thus, after, I fear, some suffering, he relapsed into a calm, about ten minutes before his death, and gently breathed his last about a quarter past three on Saturday morning, in the presence of his family, save his grandson Thomas, and myself. . . .

It is singular, that the last letter directed to him before his departure, (or immediately after, I forget which,) was one from the Prime Minister, acknowledging his pamphlet respecting the seamen!

This seems to realise the common expression, "dying in harness." A long letter accompanied the pamphlet, concocted in much weakness—it was his last letter.

The funeral will, we understand, take place on Friday.

Norfolk News Oct. 3. 1846

Clarkson is dead! Full of years, and laden with well-deserved honours, one of the earliest and most laborious advocates of the great cause of negro emancipation has descended to the tomb. Although Granville Sharp and others were his pioneers, and Wilberforce, by his parliamentary position and oratorical talents, naturally acquired more celebrity, nothing contributed more, perhaps nothing so much, to the abolition of slavery, as the pains-taking efforts of Thomas Clarkson to collect and publish the necessary evidence of the facts bearing on the question. The just self-knowledge which led him to select, and the patient self-denial which enabled him to accomplished the least showy, but not the least important or difficult part of the great work, were noble features of his character. If absolute dedication to one great object be a mark of genius, he was a genius of the highest order. If a readiness to sacrifice time, health, wealth, and life, to a lofty purpose, be heroism, he was a hero of the truest stamp. If genius and heroism consecrated to the service of humanity confer a claim to undying renown, his name will survive in distant ages as one of the most distinguished ornaments of the nineteenth century. We may hardly doubt that amidst the coming generations, superior to ourselves as we trust they will be in Christianity, in philanthropy, and in common sense, the victories of Clarkson and his illustrious coadjutors will appear far more glorious than those of Wellington or Hardinge, and even be esteemed worthy of a more grateful remembrance than the valuable and peaceful triumps of Stevenson and Brunel.

Death of Thomas Clarkson.

[Abridged from *The Ipswich Express.*]

This illustrious philanthropist died at four o'clock on Saturday morning last, at his residence, Playford-hall, near this town. He had attained the age of eighty-six; but his spirit burned bright to the last, and while he ceased not to direct his thoughts to the great question of the emancipation of the human race, he calmly looked forward to "the crown of life" laid up in heaven for the faithful followers of the cross.

He was born at Wisbech, in Cambridgeshire, on March 28th, 1760, and was educated at Cambridge. In the year 1785, Dr. Peckhard, the Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, proposed the following question to the senior Bachelors of Arts, as the subject of a Latin prize dissertation:—"Is it right to make slaves of others against their will?" At this time Clarkson was a senior bachelor in the University; and having gained a prize the previous year, he resolved to enter the lists again as a competitor. While studying the general question of slavery for the purpose of the prize essay, the whole iniquity of the negro slave trade burst upon his view.

"It is impossible" he remarked, in his History of Slavery, "to imagine the severe anguish which the composition of this essay cost me. All the pleasure I had promised myself from the literary contest was exchanged for pain, by the astounding facts that were now continually before me. It was one gloomy subject from morning till night. In the day I was agitated and uneasy, in the night I had little or no rest. I was so overwhelmed with grief, that I sometimes never closed my eyes during the whole night, and I no longer regarded my essay as a mere trial for literary distinction. My great desire was now to produce a work that should call a vigorous public effort to redress the wrongs of injured Africa."

He came to London to make inquiries, and to collect materials. He shortly produced his celebrated essay "On the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species." He obtained the prize; but the inferior motives of the collegian were annihilated by the nobler purposes of philanthropy. His aim now became the deliverance of the African race. He made a vow of eternal enmity to the slave trade, and to slavery in every form. He resolved to consecrate himself to this gigantic, and then apparently hopeless, task.

From this time Thomas Clarkson entered on his work with renewed zeal; and he found that the further he inquired into the evil of slavery and its traffic, the more diabolical and revolting did the system appear. That eminent statesman, William Wilberforce, who was one of the principal leaders in this great work, and who devoted all the energies of his powerful mind to the subject, did not, however, enter the field in the cause of the negro until two years after Thomas Clarkson had taken a lively interest in the abolition cause. Between them no rivalship existed. The question was not, "Who should have the most honour?" but, "Who should do the most good?"

On the 22nd of May, 1787, a committee was formed, consisting of twelve gentlemen, of which the deceased was a member. Their desire was, that the subject of slavery should be brought before Parliament; and, in order to do that, the fullest information of the evils connected with slavery was sought to be obtained in addition to the mass of evidence already in their possession. To obtain this, Mr. Clarkson proceeded to the ports of Bristol and Liverpool, where he met with many friends who were favourable to the cause in which he had embarked, and obtained much valuable information; but his labours there were so indefatigable and incessant as to endanger his health. Mr. Clarkson successively visited Bridgewater, Monmouth, Gloucester, Liverpool, Worcester, and Chester, at which places he found many friends; but the planters and African traders exerted themselves in every possible way to accomplish their ends; they even calumniated his character, impugned his motives, and threatened to dismiss from their service any who dared to furnish him with information. When the object of his visit had become known at Liverpool, attempts were made upon his valuable life, which was, on more than one occasion, exposed to imminent danger, for he very narrowly escaped being pushed from the pier-head by some persons who seemed determined to effect his destruction.

On the 9th of May, 1788, the abolition of the slave trade was first made the subject of parliamentary discussion. It was eloquently defended by Mr. Fox, Mr. Burke, Sir W. Dolben, Mr. Whitbread, and by several others. The discussion resulted in a motion that the subject should be investigated in the ensuing session.

In 1789 Clarkson was called upon to go to France to promote the cause of abolition. Although that country was in a state of political anarchy, and he was advised to travel in another name, he cast himself upon the protection of Providence, and prosecuted his labours fearlessly. After a residence of six months in France, Mr. Clarkson returned to England, and, after travelling many thousand miles in quest of persons who could give evidence before a committee, found that no evidence could be given as to how slaves were obtained in Africa in such large numbers. The planters said they were purchased at fairs—the abolitionists, that they were kidnapped. It was difficult to get evidence, as but few Europeans were permitted to sail up the rivers. Clarkson was informed by a friend, that he saw a man twelve months before, who was a sailor, who had been engaged in the trade; he described his person, but knew neither his name nor his residence—he appeared to belong to the navy. On this information Clarkson started, and visited successively all the ships belonging to the navy at Deptford, Woolwich, Chatham, and Sheerness without success. From Chatham he proceeded to Portsmouth, and examined

all the vessels there, with a similar result. There was but one port left, which was Plymouth, upwards of 200 miles off. On the first day, he boarded 40 ships, but did not find a single person who had been to Africa. After passing a restless night, with drooping spirits, he entered the boat the next morning agitated alternately by hope and fear; and in pursuing his task on the fifty-seventh vessel, he found the man who had been described.

Delighted with his success, Clarkson returned to London with his witness, who had, on several occasions, been present when natives had been forcibly torn from their homes. In 1793, Mr. Clarkson's physical and mental powers gave way; the excitement had been intense; for seven years he maintained a correspondence with four hundred persons, and wrote a work annually for the cause. He travelled upwards of thirty-five thousand miles in search of evidence, performing a great part of these journeys in the night. Not until 1807, after twenty years incessant toil, was the abolition of the slave trade carried. It was the last act of the Granville and Fox administration. The seals of the office and the royal assent were given simultaneously.

Mr. Clarkson now turned his attention to literature, and his first work, the "History of the Abolition of the Slave Trade," 2 vols. 8vo., was published in a few months. He afterwards published, "Thoughts on the necessity of Aboli hing Slavery;" "A Portraiture of Quakerism," 3 vols. 8vo.; "Life of William Penn," 2 vols. 8vo., &c., &c. These pursuits never diverted his attention from the great cause to which he had devoted his life. In 1818, the Emperor of Russia (the celebrated Alexander) and other distinguished individuals met in Paris, Mr. Clarkson drew up an address to the sovereigns, and requested an interview with the Emperor, which was readily granted. Soon after, a meeting of the European sovereigns took place at Aix-la-Chapelle. The Emperor, after recognising Mr. Clarkson, led him into his room, and placed a chair for him to sit upon. The Emperor approved of Mr. Clarkson's address to the sovereigns, and undertook to deliver, with his own hands, the addresses of the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia; inspected the productions of the Africans in cotton and iron, which Mr. Clarkson laid before him; and observed that Africa ought to have a fair chance of raising herself in the scale of the civilized world. A few years since Mr. Clarkson was presented with the freedom of the City of London.

Although the accumulated weight of upwards of fourscore years pressed heavily upon the shattered energies of Clarkson, so long as life and being lasted, his great anxiety was to do good. It was indeed a noble sight to enter his apartment, and see this venerable man, with sight impaired, and his once fine frame bowed down by the exertions of added years, still engaged, under much physical suffering, in efforts to lessen the sorrows of the human race. Within the last few months of his death, the cause of the sailor occupied much of his attention; the wrongs under which this useful class is suffering deeply moved his heart, and induced him to write a pamphlet and take other steps in their behalf.

Clarkson was one of those rare characters, who, in the course of every two or three centuries, are called by Providence from obscurity, to work some stupendous moral change upon the history of an empire, or the human race at large; and who can believe nothing impossible, because the work which they have to do appears an impossibility. Our readers will, no doubt, call to mind the masterly sketch of Clarkson's character by Lord Brougham in the preface to his lordship's speeches on the slave trade; but, perhaps, the noblest epitaph upon his tomb would be—"Here lies the man who excited Wilberforce to labour for the abolition of the slave trade." Granville Sharpe, and Wilberforce, have been honoured with monuments in Westminster Abbey; and it is not too much to anticipate that a similar tribute of national gratitude will be bestowed on the memory of one greater than either, who laboured more abundantly than all others, by a Ministry, under the auspices of some of whose members the slaves in our West India colonies were legally disenthralled.

Norfolk News Oct 3. 1846

GREAT MEETING
ON
AMERICAN SLAVERY,
AT ST. ANDREW'S HALL.

This meeting was held according to announcement, on Friday evening, at half-past six o'clock, and was one of the largest we have lately seen within that spacious hall. The chair was occupied by Jeremiah Colman, Esq., the Sheriff of the City.

The CHAIRMAN on rising said, that as it had been announced in the handbill, that he should take the chair on that occasion, he occupied that position with pleasure, though it was not in his power to make a long speech on the subject they were met to discuss. On the preceding evening they met to discuss the merits of the peace society. To-night they were to consider the merits or demerits of Slavery. [Hear.] Without occupying their time further, he would call on Mr. Brock to address the meeting.

The Rev. W. BROCK first addressed the meeting: He said:—Mr. Sheriff and fellow citizens, I rise under a deep sense of the responsibility which attaches to me in respect to this present meeting. So weightily has this responsibility been pressing on my spirits for some days that, but for the interests, the momentous and incalculable interests, which I believe to be at stake, the meeting might have been given up. The responsibility I feel to be a weighty one; but, mindful of the commandment of my Saviour to remember those who are in bonds as bound with them, and relying on the grace promised to those who unfeignedly desire to obey his commandments, I have no alternative but to go on, forbearing with those who misunderstand me, and forgiving those who misrepresent me, but sympathizing, *so* sympathizing with the three millions of my fellow creatures who are held in cruel bondage in America, as to do, on their behalf, just what, were our circumstances reversed, I would that they should do on mine. I am sure, Sir, I need not bespeak as though I doubted the kindness or the equity of my neighbours, I need not formally bespeak their candour and their patience to the case now to be presented to their attention. Even from those who have rather intelligibly given evidence of their displeasure I may look for that honourable and ingenuous audience which becometh all who desire to ascertain the truth. If they should be disposed, and if, under the pressure of a moral obligation, they should be compelled to strike, I say to them "Strike but hear." It is clearly incumbent on me to recount the cicumstances under which this meeting has been convened. At a meeting of the friends of the Evangelical Alliance held in this hall last Friday morning, certain statements were made relative to American Slavery, which seemed to me to claim, for the advocates and abettors of that system, our charitable and unqualified acknowledgments that they are to be pitied, rather than blamed. It seemed to me, also, that all persons who are connected with the Evangelical Alliance were expected to make that acknowledgment; and that only as they do make it, can their membership with

the Alliance be maintained. And here, Sir, I must digress, to give expression to my regret, that the gathering of this meeting should have been represented as an intentional, if not indeed a pre-arranged, act of hostility to the Evangelical Alliance. For myself, I solemnly disavow and deny the charge which that representation involves; and on my public character as a minister of the gospel, of nearly fourteen years' standing in this city, am I ready that my denial and my disavowal should rest? That the question before us this evening is connected, even remotely or indirectly, with the Evangelical Alliance, is no fault of mine. That connection was not instituted by me; and, the public of Norwich being my witnessses, it was not I, but the gentleman from Columbia, I refer to the Rev. Mr. Clark. It was not I, but Mr. Clark, by whom the connection of the Evangelical Alliance, with the subject now before us, was introduced. To him, and not to myself, must the origination of this meeting be ascribed. Again do I disclaim all hostility to the Alliance: and, with as much solemnity as I ever felt, all hostility to Mr. Clark. In this controversy, I only know him as the exponent of a sentiment which I think a dangerous sentiment. So far as our acquaintance has yet gone, I recognize him as the advocate of a doctrine which, in my conscience, I believe to be in terrible accumulation, at once disastrous to man, and dishonourable to God. Let me, as the result of any further acquaintance, find that I have been mistaken; and, with whatever kind of welcome would be most agreeable to him, I will welcome Mr. Clark to the most hearty fellowship of the domestic circle and of the church of God. I am not hostile to him personally, nor to the institution which he came to Norwich to represent. True, most true, I think the proceedings of that institution, touching American Slavery, unsatisfactory and mischievous in the extreme. Having, by a unanimous decision of its provincial aggregate Committee, declared that no slave holder should be admissible to the Evangelical Alliance; and, having thereby renewed the protest which the British Christian public has so often uttered against American Slavery, the Evangelical Alliance annulled their declaration, cancelled their protest, threw open their doors to the slave owner, whilst, with the whole subject before it, it did nothing on behalf of the thousands of devoted Christians who are suffering from day to day the most horrible cruelties of slavery, and the terrible, unutterable indignities of an internal slave trade. For what was done and for what was left undone on this matter, I deem the Evangelical Alliance to have grievously erred. And am I to be condemned for thinking this? Am I to be denounced as hostile for saying this? Am I become an enemy for avowing what I believe to be the truth? If it be a duty in me to speak the truth in love, it is equally the duty of those who are opposed to me to let me speak the truth. At all events I must speak it, encouraged after all by the language of the apostle, "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; he that judgeth me is the Lord." Reavowing my disclaimure of all hostility, I return from my digression. I was saying, Sir, that the speech of Mr. Clark appears to me to be claiming our sympathy for the American Slave holder, as for a man who was certainly doing wrong, but who was doing wrong sorely and expressly against his will. And I was not alone in thinking this. The loud hiss in one direction, and the cry of shame in another, indicated the impression which the people were receiving, whilst the interruption, noticed by Mr. Clark, "no apoligy for slavery here," put that impression beyond all doubt. Let this be borne in mind; my voice was not heard by the meeting until the meeting itself had interfered. I was not a leader, but a follower. On the bidding of the chairman Mr. Clark had actually resumed his seat before I interposed at all. So unquestionable is all this, that I confess I have been surprised at the attempts which have been made to attach to me personally, the stigma of ungenerously labouring to bring Mr. Clark and his address, into odium and disrepute. I have confidence in the charitable friends who were present on the occasion, that they will not allow that unworthy attempt to implicate me, to pass unrebuked. When Mr. Clark had resumed his seat, I sought permission from the chair, to elicit such information from him as I think would at once have removed the pro-slavery impression that his speech had so generally produced. The permission was withholden, and I had nothing left me but the opportunity of such a meeting as the present one to do what I felt to be right. I accordingly announced my intention of calling such a meeting in the following words. "As the matter has been mooted in this city and noticed too in connexion with the Evangelical Alliance, I shall take a very early opportunity of setting the inhabitants of Norwich right on the subject of American Slavery." Now why do I quote the words of my announcement, words for whose recurrence to my memory I am indebted to a friend who took them down. I have quoted them in defence of myself against the charge of hastiness; for with hastiness as well as angriness, have I been somewhat freely charged. I said "I would take a very early opportunity" of setting my fellow citizens right, and I made the opportunity as early as possible, that we might have the presence of Mr. Clark himself. By my friend Mr. Reed, I was urged to have this meeting even earlier still, that no chance might be lost of securing the company of Mr. Clark. So much for my hastiness, of which along with my angriness, I think from honourable men at least, we shall hear no more. You are prepared to hear that I invited the attendance of Mr. Clark. I will read to you the note which I addressed to him on Saturday night.

SIR—I hereby inform you that on Friday evening next, there will be a public meeting at St. Andrew's Hall, at which Mr. George Thompson will be present, to reply to the statements made by you on Friday last, relative to American Slavery.

To that meeting I invite you, that you may have an opportunity of retracting your statements if they shall be proved to be incorrect, or of confirming them if the disproof I shall adduce shall be found to fail.

My invitation is given you in all candour and sincerity. You shall have a fair hearing, and shall be at perfect liberty to take any measures that are honourable for the corroboration of your opinions and your statements of fact. Waiting your reply,

I am, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM BROCK.

St. George's, Norwich, Saturday Evening.

To that note I received the following reply:—

MY DEAR BROTHER—For so, I trust, you will allow me to call you, as a minister of Christ, in answer to your note of Saturday night, I beg to acquaint you that before I came to Norwich arrangements had been made for my attendance at a public meeting in Buckinghamshire to-morrow. You will thus see that I cannot stay for the meeting to which you have kindly invited me on Friday night. I am, however, unfeignedly anxious not to be the occasion of any impression unfavourable to the Anti-Slavery cause being left upon the minds of the inhabitants of Norwich. I therefore purpose taking this evening, at Calvert Street Chapel, (where I have engaged to conduct the public service,) the only opportunity now open to me, of stating publicly some facts explanatory of my own position and views in relation to this subject. As a Christian and as a stranger I grieved that I was not invited to call on you, as I think I could have given you perfect satisfaction as to what I stated in the meeting of last week. As a coloured man, and as a pastor in a Slave State over a church of coloured men, part of whom are slaves, I am experiencing, every day

and every hour, the oppressive and crushing influence of the detestable system of slavery. Whatever may be the exceptions (and which do not deserve to be named) the universal rule is oppression of the whole man, soul and body. From what I have experienced in my own person and feelings (although never myself a slave) I can be anything sooner than be a friend, in any shape or form, to that odious and inhuman system. If, therefore, any word or expression which you may have heard me utter, should have conveyed an impression contrary to that, I hope you will have the Christian charity to believe it a mistake of my head or tongue, and not of my heart, designing to palliate, in the least degree, that oppressive system. Begging an interest in your prayers, I remain, dear brother, your fellow servant in the gospel of Christ.

M. M. CLARK.

With this letter, I confess that on many accounts, I was, and am, well pleased. So far as it goes, I rejoice exceedingly that it ever came into my hands. To whatever extent it exonerates Mr. Clark, let him be exonerated. To whatever extent it goes, even indirectly, to condemn me, let me be condemned. The first impression on my mind was, that refutation of Mr. Clark's statement was now unnecessary; that he had, in fact, refuted himself. When, however, *when* I obtained a transcript of Mr. Clark's speech my impression altered immediately; and, on comparing his speech with his letter, I found that the obligation I had undertaken was substantially unaffected by anything which this letter contained. Mr. Clark maintains that the Christian slave holder cannot help himself if he would. This must be refuted. Mr. Clark recommends and insists upon gradual emancipation: this must be refuted. Mr. Clark intimates very broadly that in the Divine blessing resting upon slave holding churches there is evidence that the practice of those churches is consistent with Christianity; this must be refuted: and our friend, Mr. Thompson is here to refute it all. Right glad am I to welcome him again in Norwich, as the staunch and unfailing advocate of the oppressed. Long will his former speech in this hall, on the subject of Colonial Slavery, be remembered. Long, I doubt not, will the speech be remembered, which, on the subject of American Slavery, he will deliver in this same hall to-night. To him—yes, and to yourselves, Mr. Sheriff and fellow citizens—to us all, slavery is just the same, whether its enormities are perpetrated in Kentucky or in Jamaica. Humanity, in our esteem, is just as sensitive a thing, and just as sacred a thing, and just as much a thing, kindred and homogeneous with our own natures, whether it be mutilated, and tortured, and massacred, as formerly in our colonies; or as at present in the Southern States. If this hall became tremulous with the agitations of philanthropy when slavery, as prevailing in one place was denounced, it is I trust, prepared to become tremulous as in its prevalence in another place it shall be denounced again. Our benevolence, our justice, our religion know no geographical limit, care for no political peculiarities, entertain no considerations whatever about colour, or community, or creed. If men are bought and sold as cattle are bought and sold. If, restless beneath the cruelties and inhumanities of their oppressors, men, yes and women too, are lacerated with the knotted lash, branded with the red hot iron, separated remorselessly from one another and from their children; and, if endeavouring to regain their freedom, they are brought down by the deadly rifle in agony unimaginable to expire, shall the voice of British Christians be silent. Shall we whose philanthropy was formerly so eloquent, so resolute, so untiring, be compromising, inactive, fainthearted, deaf and dumb? No! You answer no. And your answer will become increasingly emphatic, and irrepressibly indignant, when you hear that men are massacred, that women are violated, that amidst systematized licentiousness children are reared for the slave market with the sanction, tacit or expressed, of the majority of the ministers and churches of Jesus Christ. Are you incredulous? Is there a man yonder whispering the charge of calumny against the speaker? Let him hear before he ventures to speak his whisper out! Miss Martineau declares that all which has been said in England of the hatred of the whites to the blacks in America is short of the truth. Describing "a merry-hearted child," who was a little slave, a born slave, she says, "When I looked at her, and thought of the fearful disobedience to the first of moral laws, the cowardly treachery, the cruel abuse of power involved in thus dooming to blight, a being so helpless, so confiding, so full of promise, a horror came over me which sickened my very soul. To see slaves is not to be reconciled to slavery." Citizens of Norwich, hear this testimony of your own townswoman, whom no ingenuity could prove to be a false accuser, whom no desperation would dare to taunt with fanaticism, whose sensibilities and sympathies, however ardent, are regulated and expressed under the severest controul of her profound love of truth. Read all her statements on this appalling subject, and you will see our whole case made out. Read, especially, a most important statement in her first volume of "Western Travels," wherein she declares, in respect to the danger to which any advocate of Emancipation is exposed, that danger may be dreaded, not so much in the south as in the north and west. That is to say, those states of America which are called free States are just the places where slavery finds its warmest advocacy, and where it meets its staunchest friends. And, if the testimony of Miss Martineau is not sufficient, let us take that of Charles Dickens. In his "American Notes," we learn that public opinion has delivered the slaves over to the gentle mercies of their masters; has made the laws, and denied them legislative protection; has knotted the lash, heated the branding iron, loaded the rifle, and shielded the murderer. Public opinion threatens the abolitionist with death if he venture to the south; and drags him with a rope about his middle, in broad unblushing noon, through the first city in the east. In the city of St. Louis, public opinion has burned a slave alive at a slow fire within a few years; and has, to this day, kept on the bench of justice, the man who declared that the murder of that slave was not punishable by law. And all this injustice, according to Mr. Dickens, is inseparable from the state of things with which humanity and truth are called to deal. And he says, "Slavery is not a whit the more endurable because some hearts are to be found which can partially resist its hardening influences; nor can the indignant tide of honest wrath stand still, because, in its onward course, it overwhelms a few who are comparatively innocent, among a host of guilty." Well, indeed, might Mr. Dickens speak of an indignant tide of honest wrath. What did he see as he sojourned in America? Announcements in all directions, "Cash for negroes! Cash for negroes!" What did he read as he took up the newspapers day by day? Advertisements such as these:—"Ran away, the negress Fanny. Had on an iron band about her neck." "Ran away the negro Hown; also Griso his wife." "Detained at the police jail, the negro wench Myra. Has several marks of lashing, and has irons on her feet." "Ran away, a negro woman and two children; a few days before she went off, I burnt her with a hot iron on the left side of her face. I tried to make the letter M." "Ran away, Sam. He was shot a short time since through the hand, and has several shots in his left arm and side." "Two hundred and fifty dollars reward for my negro man, named Jim. He is much marked with shot in his right thigh. The shot entered on the outside between the hip and knee joints." "One hundred dollars will be given for my two fellows, Abram and Frank. Abram has a wife in Liberty county, and a sister in Savannah. Frank has a wife in Liberty county, a mother at Thunderbolt, and a sister in Savannah." "Ran away, Paulidore, my slave. I understand General Hayne has purchased his wife and children, and has them now on his plantation, where, no doubt,

the fellow is lurking. Fifty dollars reward." "One hundred and twenty negroes for sale. The subscribed has just arrived from Virginia, with 120 lively young negroes, of both sexes and of every description, several women with children, small girls suitable for nurses, and several small boys *without their mothers*." Bad enough all this you will admit, but what say you to this? "Two hundred dollars reward. Ran away a negro man named Ben, also another negro named Rigdon. I will give a reward of 100 dollars for each of the above negroes, to be delivered to me, or to be confined in the Jail of Lenoir or Jones county, or *for the killing of them, so that I can see them*." Surely, exclaims some one, surely the law interferes with a miesreant such as this. What says the justice of America to an enormity such as this? Hearken and you shall hear, concerning this very case where two hundred dollars reward are offered for the murder of these two slaves, there is a document signed by two Justices of the Peace, which runs thus, "Whereas, complaint has this day been made before us, of the absence from their master's service of the slaves Ben and Rigdon, we do hereby, by virtue of an Act of the Assembly of this State, of North Carolina, declare that, if the said slaves do not surrender themselves immediately, that any person may kill and destroy the said slaves, by such means as he may think fit, without accusation, or impeachment of any crime or offence for so doing, or without incurring any penalty or forfeiture thereby. Given under our hands and seals this 12th of November, 1836. B. Coleman, Jas. Jones." Thus you see they not only devise mischief, but they devise mischief by a law. I might enumerate similar advertisements indefinitely: but I forbear, that attention may be given for a moment to other crimes and abominations of American Slavery. *Think of the inequalities of the laws which it has enacted!* If any man cut out the tongue, or put out an eye, or destroy any limb, or cruelly burn any slave, he incurs a penalty of 500 dollars. If any man cut, or break any chain, or collar, which the slave owner has put upon his victim to prevent his escape, he incurs a penalty of 1000 dollars, and an imprisonment for two years!! That is American Slavery. *Think of its determination to keep the slaves in ignorance.* Teaching slaves to read, is prohibited under the severest penalties. In the state of Louisiana, if a man venture to defy this ungodly prohibition a second time, he is put to death. A father may be flogged for teaching his own child to read the Bible; and if any slaves are found assembling for religious worship, they may be flogged. The state of Louisiana has legislated for the welfare of the slave. And how think you? without mercy and without redress. Why, that he *shall* have 2½ hours out of the 24, for his rest. That is American slavery. *Think of its violation of the marriage tie.* A master may at any time compel the separation of man and wife. No matter what the affection of the parties, no matter what the attachments of sons and daughters, despite the commandment of the Almighty, they are ruthlessly put asunder. There was a gentleman present at the Evangelical Alliance, who has been publicly charged with omitting from his marriage service, when he is marrying slaves, the well known clause, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Whether this charge is true or not, this is true; Dr. Smyth has not dared to deny it. And this is true too; that an associated body of Christian ministers, belonging to my own denomination, officially decided, that as the slaves are not free agents, so the separation of man and wife is as independent of their own consent, or their own control, as is their dissolution by death. That is American Slavery. [Hear.] *Think of its barbarous appliances for the maintenance of its power.* Let me state to you a fact. "It is the law of slavery that the child shall follow the condition of the mother." Bear that law in mind, and take this illustration of its effect:—A Georgian slave ran away from her master, and found a home amidst the so called savages of Florida. She married, and had children. One of her daughters on growing up became the wife of a chief of their tribe. The man who had ruined the mother of this woman claimed her as his property; and, by the hands of a government officer, seized her and bore her off. What followed? Her chieftain husband, aided by his tribe, attacked the robbers of his own flesh and retook her. What followed then? The most horrible warfare of which we can conceive, until the United States rushed to the defence of the slave owner, and devoted their whole resources to his defence, until they had exterminated the whole tribe. The details of this horrible onslaught may be inferred from the fact, that the government of the United States sent to Cuba for a pack of blood hounds; and with those blood hounds hunted down, mangled, and destroyed the men who had heroically ventured to rescue the Georgian slave. How was the barbarity appreciated, think you? Hear a suggestion of the *Charleston Observer:* "It may not be improper to suggest the propriety of publicly commending this expedition in prayer to God on the Sabbath." That is American Slavery. And that brings me to the most solemn, and, for our present meeting, the most appropriate part of this awful subject. "Nobody defends American Slavery" I am told. "Look at Mr. Clark's letter and do him the justice to say that it is in no wise defended by him." By all means; but to the man who says "read Mr. Clark's letter," I reply, "read Mr. Clark's speech;" and do me the justice to say, that it leaves my complaint against Mr. Clark not only uncontradicted but untouched. I complain that he exonerated the slave owner; especially the Christian slave owner. But what is the fact? Why that at this moment the slave owner defends his system pertinaciously, which is bad; and that at this moment the American churches are the bulwark of American slavery, which is inexpressibly worse. Are you incredulous again? Is there a subdued accusation that I am bearing false witness against my neighbour? Hear me out! What are the criteria whereby to test the sentiments of the American churches on the subject of American Slavery? We may take the preaching of the ministers of those churches, whereby the public sentiment of the country is of course powerfully affected from time to time. There are at least twenty thousand of those ministers. Do they denounce the wickedness of the man stealer? Do they faithfully, and with Apostolic heedlessness of all consequences, rebuke the men by whom the system is carried on, and in whose hands its abolition rests. Not they. On the contrary, they will preach the lawfulness of slavery. They will sell a slave to purchase communion plate. They will pale off a portion of their churches as the negro pew. They will refuse to administer the Lord's supper to the black man, until the white man has been just served. They will receive stipends for their ministerial labour, which they know have been obtained in the slave market, from the sale of their fellow men. Yes, and more than this, they will meet in their ecclesiastical convocations, and there embody their sentiments, concerning slavery, in official acts. Witness the decisions of one such convocation: "Resolved, that we wholly disclaim any right, with an intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave holding states of this union." Witness the decision of another convocation: "Resolved, that it is the sense of this conference, that slavery, as it exists in the United States, is not a moral evil." That must suffice as a specimen of the sentiment of the American Churches, touching the inhumanities of American Slavery. And that they are fair specimens, I think I might prove from the proceeding of a large meeting, held some time ago in London, on the whole subject of slavery throughout the world. I refer to the Anti-Slavery Convention, whose judgment, on the subject of American Christian Slave-holding, may be gathered from a speech of a

most excellent clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Johnston, who said, "Let the authorities of the Episcopal Church discountenance those of her ministers who dared to countenance such a system. Let the doors of the Archepiscopal palace at Canterbury be closed to the slave-sanctioning dignitaries of the church that might come from America. He for one would not hold out the right hand of fellowship to the owner of a slave; and if his Bishop were to enjoin him to do so, he would say "No, no, Lord, I will do no such thing." Such was the feeling of British Christians in 1840. And such, sir, I think the feeling of British Christians ought to be in 1846. And because I am apprehensive that that feeling is somewhat altering; because I perceive intimations that the influence of the Evangelical Alliance will be used to alter it yet more and more, I venture to attempt to put my neighbours and my countrymen on their guard. Woe will verily betide the world if British Christians give in to the plausibilities of the Americans about their constitutional arrangements, and their peculiar institutions. [Loud and long continued cheering,] What was the sentiment which was responded to with such hearty sympathy in this hall last night? It was this, "Men are not made for peculiar institutions, but all institutions are made for men." Just so—and therefore the institution which keeps three millions of men in bondage, should be broken up. At all events, Christian men should try to break it up. This, the professing Christian men of America are not doing. They know that 150 thousand are added to their slave population every year. They know that it is imprisonment and death to teach a negro to read. They know that slave sales are going on perpetually, even at the very door of their Hall of Congress. They know that the Union itself is directly implicated in the slavery of the state of Columbia. They know that blood-hounds have been employed in the service of the slave owner. They know that an excellent minister of Christ, Mr. Toney, was recently imprisoned six years in Maryland gaol, for assisting slaves to escape, and they know that in that gaol he died. They know that mothers are kept on purpose to bring children into the world, who are presently to be torn from their embrace. They know that licentious men are provided with means, at which even a Corinthian would have blushed—with means for the most unbridled gratification of their most brutal lusts. They know that humanity, insulted, degraded, agonized, expiring humanity, turns its imploring eye to them for interposition and redress. And where are they? On the high places of the land, faithful to their profession and their God? No. Where are the 20,000 ministers, whose influence Judge Berney declares would bring the whole abomination to a speedy end. Why, they are in their studies writing pamphlets, or in their synods passing resolutions, or in their pulpits delivering sermons, or in their societies holding conversations to which the slave owner, the slave dealer, and the slave breeder point with exultation and say to us scornfully, and quite conclusively, "That is our defence." Sir, this is too bad to be quietly endured; and, therefore, my desire—vehement, intense, profound desire is to see such interest on this awful question excited, as shall bring the abomination which makes desolate to a perpetual end.

The Rev. T. Clowes then rose and said, the object of my rising here is plainly and manfully to announce that I entirely understand Mr. Clark's speech in a totally different sense from Mr. Brock. [Applause.] Now I hope I shall be able to get through the very difficult position in which I am placed, with some little degree of clearness, and some little degree of freedom from any compact with all that filth and abomination which adhere to the subject. Now I maintain that I have just the same view as Mr. Brock has about American Slavery. [Hear.] And I believe that there was not an individual in this hall on Friday, who entertained any different feeling about American Slavery in the abstract. Now let me endeavour to set you right, as far as I understood Mr. Clark's speech. I have not yet had the opportunity of reading it, therefore I shall not enter into a defence of it. I shall only state the impression which I myself received respecting it, while sitting beside my friend Mr. Brock. Now I certainly quite acknowledge that though I understood why the subject of slavery was on that occasion introduced, yet I felt that it was an extremely difficult question to be introduced by a man of colour, who lives in America, and does not express himself very fluently nor to my mind always very clearly. But perhaps you will say; what then was your impression of Mr. Clark's speech? My impression was this, that he disclaimed in so many words the slighest sympathy with the system of slavery. I maintain that he did disclaim that. [Hear.] I do not wish to be pertinacious, I should not like to fall into a quarrel with a phonographic writer, because that would be a dangerous thing. I only say, that I am ready to hold up my hand in the cause of justice, and give my evidence that I do believe that Mr. Clark disclaimed the slightest sympathy with the principle of American Slavery. I may be wrong, but I don't the least believe I am. I understood him to mean that, under circumstances which he was acquainted with, and with which many of us are acquainted—that, under the circumstances in which some persons were situated, there might be Christian brethren who were still involuntary owners of slaves—[cries of "No, no!"]—and that we ought not to withhold from them—[laughter]—now you should not laugh, when you do not know what I am going to say—["No apology for slavery!"]—with regard to what Mr. Clark was driving at, he said nothing about American Slavery being tolerable. [Hear, hear.] He disclaimed it; but showed that there might be circumstances in which Christian brethren might be involuntary holders of slaves. [Cries of "impossible" and uproar, in which a gentleman asked Mr. Clowes to explain the possibility of such a case.]

Mr. Brock requested that a fair hearing should be given, observing that so far as Mr. Clowes had gone, he had not said a word which he (Mr. B.) would not say over again; and, so far, was really making out his case.

Mr. Clowes proceeded—I don't know whether I am making out Mr. Brock's case, I should be glad to make it out; all I mean to try to make out is, that, I think, he misunderstood the drift of Mr. Clark's speech. [No, no.] You ask me to explain how such a thing is possible; [hear, hear;] now, suppose my father—I don't like to speak about my father in that sort of way, but some people have the misfortune not to have so good a father as I have. Some people happen to be the sons of the most intolerable scoundrels, and most audacious knaves: yet those men sometimes turn out, through the grace of God, godly, pious, benevolent, and philanthropic. I say, supposing when I was living in America, or living here, that that scoundrel who had dealt in human flesh, had, by a will left me all his slave property; in such a case I *must* be the owner. [Uproar, cries "give them up."] Why, dear friends, cannot you comprehend that until I had legally got rid of them, I *must* be the owner, (no, no, and uproar,) what I believe to be the case was—what I conceived to be, (and if I am wrong, it is well that I should be enlightened) is that the laws of that country are such, that if I went there I should run a risk of being tarred and feathered, and hung up, if I were to set those slaves free. Let me ask our friend here (Mr T.) whether I should run such a risk? (Mr. T. I will answer that presently, sir, I will answer it presently,) I should not relish that treatment, but I should endeavour to escape from it, if I could. Supposing I said, I never will hold my fellow-men as goods or chattels, come what will, of my own skin and bone. Suppose I said, now, while I have these slaves here, I suppose I may talk to them; I suppose I may say something to them, though I must not teach them to read. I may say

something to them about their souls. Now, if I turn them adrift, in defiance of the laws, what is to become of them? They now are your property, and you may defend them, you can treat them well, you can provide for them, but if you turn them adrift they may be kidnapped in every quarter, and hunted to death. I dont wish to say there are many such cases—I dont believe such nonsense—I only say, that there may be several such cases, and in such instances as that I should not mind one jot or tittle if you kicked me out of this hall, for not being a Christian. I should avow, that I would bear the reproach of being a slave-holder, if I might thereby continue to have a powerful hand over those slaves for their good; and this is what I understand by the possibility of the case. I do not mean to palliate slavery of any sort; I come merely to show you that I understood Mr. Clark to be driving at the point, that there might be Christian brethren who involuntarily had slaves. Now I asked a friend who I met the other day (I don't know whether he is here present, I think he is not), it is taking a great liberty to mention his name in such a meeting as this, but it is necessary that a man should be an intelligent man, or else his opinion on such a point would go for nothing. I said, then, to Mr. John Wright of Buxton, than whom there is no more inveterate enemy to slavery in this county, nor a more enlightened and liberal man, what did you think Clark was driving at in St. Andrew's hall on Friday? I think he was driving at this, said he, to show that, under certain circumstances in America, we ought not to unchristianize every person who might involuntarily be a slave-holder. Mr. Brock mentioned to me, that a friend of his and mine rather accorded with his views, and I have no doubt that he might have given Mr. B. that impression; but I directly wrote to that individual—he did not give me leave to read his note here, but I shall take that liberty. It was Andrew Johnston, coadjutor of Buxton, in a great part of his labours. I said to him, will you have the goodness to tell me what Clark was driving at on Friday, at St. Andrew's Hall: he says, "I conceive that he was endeavouring to show, that American slave-holders should not be excluded from communion with the Church of Christ, *merely* because they are slave-holders. [Hear, hear.] Now, he says, it is a question we are not called upon, some of us, decidedly, openly, publicly, practically to settle. I must say, that in such a case as I have put, I would act in the way I have stated; and I should be perfectly willing to take the consequences at the hands of this, or any other assembly in the Christian world, who would listen to the circumstances in which I was placed. But I will come to another case: I met our friend Joseph John Gurney yesterday, and I told him what I thought the man was driving at, and he stated to me (if I misrepresent him in this matter, I wish to have it understood that I do not do so willingly): When I was in the West India Islands, I knew a woman who was an owner of slaves: she seemed to be a good, pious, and godly woman, and she told me, that every morning when she got up, she prayed to God to give a blessing to the labours of Fowell Buxton, that she might so get rid of her slaves. Now for the time being that good woman held slaves and was the owner of them, and I would have held out, as I have no doubt Joseph John Gurney did, the right-hand of fellowship to her; and would have said: May God hear and answer your prayers, and deliver you from this most awful burden. This was not in America; for anything I know it might have been in the British dominions, therefore I would not altogether throw stones at everybody who has not come over to clear themselves, as a country, from that of which we have only just wiped our hands. Mr. Brock seems to me to charge every American individual, who happens to be a slave-holder, with the deeds of the slave-holding state to which he belongs, because the laws were made by public opinion. Now I say, that a man who may be compelled to have slaves, and cannot see his way clear to get rid of them, without sacrificing their interest, is not responsible for the iniquities of the law which public opinion forces on him. The state says to him, we will tie your slaves about your neck, and you shall not get rid of them, if you do, it shall be at your peril; we will apply the lynch law, and against that there is no appeal. Now, talking about separating the husband and wife—I don't know what Mr. Brock's opinion may be about our poor law. [Applause.] Now Mr. Brock would not mean to say that, either he or I was responsible for the separation of a man from his wife; be it right or be it wrong, that he or I was responsible for that which was past, as law by public opinion in the land. Many people are thoroughly opposed to that law, and they have no part or share in any kind of discredit that may be attached to it: yet on the other hand there are some good and pious people, who feel that it is essential for the morality and good order of the house in which those persons are to be relieved, that such a law should exist. [Disapprobation.] After some further remarks, the speaker observed, that the letter Mr. Clark had written, was to him perfectly satisfactory. When, however, the speech should be read, he might think that there were points that needed an explanation, and that Mr. Brock might have been allowed to have asked his questions at the alliance meeting. He concluded by thanking them for their patient attention to his observations. [Cheers.]

Mr. Brock said, fortunately for himself he had two witnesses, both intelligent young men, who heard the conversation that took place between himself and Mr. Johnstone, to which Mr. Clowes had referred. Mr. Johnstone did unquestionably say to him, (Mr. B.,) that the getting up of this meeting was quite necessary and right, and that he was of opinion that he ought to have been allowed to ask Mr. Clark the questions he was desirous of proposing.

Mr. George Thompson next addressed the meeting: he was received with loud applause. He said, he begged it to be distinctly understood, that he joined issue with the Rev. Gentleman who had just addressed them; and he challenged him to a public discussion of the proposition whether a man under any conceivable circumstances, can claim and exercise a right of property in a human being. (Hear and cheers.) He would take the negative of that proposition. He was there to maintain that it was an eternal impossibility for one human being without the most stupendous crime against his God, to stand for one moment in the relation of the owner of another man. [Cheers.] That was his Anti-slavery creed: of all slave-holders in the universe that man was the worst, by whatever virtues his character may be irradiated, who, having gospel light, and professing to be a disciple of the Saviour, in whose covenant of grace all were included, yet gave the sanction of his virtues, his character, and his Christianity to that unutterable crime, the claiming of property in man. [Applause.] With regard to the question of the laws he distinctly stated that there was not in the United States of America, from the banks of the river Niagara to those of the river Sabine: nor from the States washed by the Atlantic to those beneath the shade of the rocky mountains, a law, or a fragment of a law, against the emancipation of the slaves. There was not a slave owner in the United States who could not in one instant emancipate his slave. [Cheers.] That then disposed of the business of the law for the present. Before he came to this question he would observe that from that hour forth, the business of his life on every opportunity should be, to save his beloved country from the reproach of giving the sanction of its holy religion to the crime of slave holding in any part of the world; and he told that Reverend gentleman, (Mr. Clowes) that he had preached a religion eternally at war with the religion of Jesus Christ. These scenes

had never ceased to haunt his imagination; often had he wept in secret over these poor, disinherited outcasts of men, whom avarice had coined into slaves. It had been his wont all through his life, when he would sympathize with a fellow-mortal, to put himself in his situation. Now, he wanted his Rev. friend to do this; whenever he would know what slavery was, let him not go to the Evangelical Alliance, whose members were trying to love one another, but were afraid that slavery would not let them do so. Let him go into his chamber, and if he could, put himself into the heart of a slave, and feel pang for pang with him; feel the sickness of hope deferred, realize the experience of that human, immortal, unaccountable, mysterious, blood-redeemed being, who might not call his hands, his feet, his heart, his wife, his progeny his own; and he would come upon that platform and instead of apologizing for men stealers, women whippers, and cradle plunderers—Mr. Clowes, I did not apolize for them. [Cries of order, chair.] Mr. Thompson resumed, he charged the gentleman with saying, that there might be many slave-holders who were involuntarily such, and to whom he would hold out the right hand of fellowship. He had said, that there were circumstances in which he would keep his hold upon human property for their own good. He did not care how a man claimed such right, if he *did* claim it, and exercised it, and vindicated it, he (Mr. T.) told him that he was in principle and practice the basest of all robbers in the world. [Cheers.] He begged to say that he was speaking of principle, he was not speaking of amiable, enlightened, and wealthy men, but he was speaking of slave-owners; he said again they were cradle plunderers and women whippers.

Mr. Clowes—Nobody denies that—there is no controversy between us on that point; and I am sure those who understand plain English cannot suppose that there was.

Mr. Thompson—I do understand plain English. [Great confusion.]

Mr. Clowes—Then I say you pervert plain English I beg leave [uproar.] I must speak. [Renewed uproar and hisses.]

Mr. Thompson did not want his reverend friend to misunderstand him; he was about to discuss plainly and honestly the principle of slave holding, under all known or conceivable circumstances: that was the proposition he laid before that gentleman. He maintained that no man, under any conceivable circumstance could, without the usurpation of the prorogative of God himself, stand for an instant in the relation of the owner of a fellow man. [Cheers.] And that there was no circumstances in the world that could justify him for a moment in appearing to stand in that relation; if the universe were to give way at his feet, it was his bounden duty, reverencing the law of God as above all others, to see that no human being belonged to himself. Duty was his, but results were God's. He should pursue the straight line of duty, snd clear his hands of this heinous sin of slave-holding; and if he were hanged, his martyrdom would do more to liberate the captives of the world, than all the kindness of all the slave-holders that ever lived upon the world's surface. Oh, it was a horrid doctrine that, of doing evil that good might come; it was the doctrine of devils, and never was it more unadulterated diabolism, than when it was applied to slavery. To keep his power over those human beings for the sake of their souls? Was that the way souls were to be saved? [No, no.] Was that listening to the voice spoken on Sinai, or the voice heard at Jerusalem 1800 years ago? No, "*fiat justitia ruat cœlum*," Let man do his duty and he who sat on high would take care of the consequences. He had remarked that in his youth, it was his wont when sympathizing with a fellow creature to try and place himself in his situation. He did so in childhood with regard to the slave. He was with him in the burning village of Africa; he was with him on his dreary journey from the far interior to the sea coast, where he was to be shipped off into returnless captivity; he was with him on his way to his house of bondage and on the plantation. He was with him as he wandered by moonlight on the Sea-beach after the toils of the day, his thoughts in Africa, in his rude hut, the young barbarians at play but he, the father and the husband, never permitted to see them more. The hatred of slavery engendered in his youth grew with his growth, and strengthened with his strength. In 1828 he took part in a debate, which lasted eleven nights, on the subject of slavery, and in favour of emancipation. In 1829 he debated the question at the City of London Literary and Scientific Institution. In 1830 he heard that incomparable speech delivered by the ever-to-be-lamented Dr. Andrew Thompson, of Edinburgh; in that speech he demonstrated to every mind the essential sinfulness of slavery, and the duty of immediate, unconditional, and entire emancipation. It was that speech that made him, once for all, a believer in that doctrine—a believer in the duty and safety of immediate emancipation, for duty is ever safety, and wandering from duty is ever danger. [Hear, hear.] Tampering with God's law is very bad policy, and recommending] and preaching it is very bad policy too. From that time he went forth as an exponent of the principles, purposes, and plans of the London Anti-slavery Association. He laboured sincerely and earnestly in the cause, never letting down the sacred standard, but ever keeping it above: ever finding men with hearts that would respond to the truth, the simple and unadulterated truth; aye, there was not a heart in the universe that when slavery was put before it would not cry out, let it be accursed, let it be extinguished, whatever the consequences might be. [Hear.] Their conflict in that struggle was a brief, though a severe one; there were feelings that he should never forget, relating to the simple, beautiful, and unvarnished history of the abolition of the slave, by one who had just gone to his rest—by one who, only a few weeks ago, placed in his (Mr. T's.) hands, a record of his last and most matured thoughts upon the subject of slavery. There it was, (holding up the manuscript to view,) blotted and blurred by the blind old man: "many weary days," said he, "and weeks have I been writing this manuscript, I place it in your hands, and in the hands of your beloved friend." What did this venerable man's manuscript say? "Slavery, as it exists in America, and especially among the churches of America, is downright atheism; (hear,) it is infidelity; it is the dehumanizing of man; it is the dethroning of the Deity himself." (Hear, hear.) They should never seek to tamper with that which in the abstract was called sin; there was no sin in the abstract: sin was all in the concrete: there was no sin in law: the sin was only in the law breaker, or the law obeyer. There was no sin in institutions; no sin separate from the sinner: it was the sinner they wanted to hold up to light. There were plenty of men who would come upon that platform and read the parable of Nathan and the ewe lamb; but only here and there could a man be found who would boldly point the finger and assert "thou art the man." Now they did not want the parable so much as the application. When he recounted the horrors of slavery, and summed up its criminality, he pointed to a Doctor of Divinity from Charleston, in the Evangelical Alliance, and he said, "thou art the man." He there stood forth to proclaim Dr. Smyth, a member of the Alliance, recently held in London, a most notorious slave holder. [Applause.] He was the man who dared not read in the marriage service, those sacred words, "what God hath joined together let no man put asunder." Look at Dr. Cox. From his speeches in Liverpool and Manchester, he appeared exuberant and overflowing in

his hatred of Slavery. Well, two short months before he trod the shores of our country he was sitting in the moderator's chair, in an assembly in the United States, listening to speeches in defence of Slavery from Doctors of Divinity, Reverend Clergymen, and elders of the Church; in the reports of which he (Mr. T.) did not see that he had uttered any denunciation of their crimes; on the contrary, he had said, "Send me to the Evangelical Alliance, and your honour is safe in my keeping. If there be ought said or done to call your Christianity in question, I will walk out of the Alliance and shake the dust from my feet." He spoke in the presence of ready writers, and he had spoken it on one side of the strand while the Dr. was eloquently descanting on Christian Union on the other. He loved union; and God speed the day when union will be the motto under which the human family should live; but until it could be a union in righteousness, a union in freedom, a union that would allow him to see his brethren, the black men liberated from their thaldrom, never let that union come. And if it were to be a union of white men, to discard the claims of the black, perish every such union. [Applause.] The speaker then adverted to the supposed case of slaves being held in slavery for their own good. Hold slaves for their good! O if anybody wanted to know how to punish him he would tell him the way. Let him get up in St. Andrew's Hall, or any where else, and talk about holding slaves for their good. He assured him that he would then inflict a punishment upon his spirit as great as 39 lashes would be to his back. Hold slaves for their own good! Violate God's law for the good of God's children! Was there any thing better than liberty? "Tell me," said the speaker, "poor men would you like to be slaves for your own good? That man yonder with the hairy cap on (pointing to a navvy) [laughter] would you like to be a slave for your own good? Then would you like to be a slave to the Rev. Mr. Clowes for your own good? [Renewed laughter.] What's a slave? A thing, the man is gone. What's a slave? A piece of property. What's a slave? A man whose every function is annihilated. He who enslaves a man, what is there in the universe that he would not enslave? I have no right to have a slave till I can make a man. [Applause.] When I can make a man, I may call him mine. God made man, he is therefore not mine. Hands off! he belongs to God. You dare to blaspheme, by saying, 'I will take him and hold him for his good.' What! dethrone God for the good of the slave! If you make an idol and worship it you dethrone God; and if you seize a man and make him a slave you rob God! Look upon his face, black though it be, it bears the stamp and impress of Jehovah. Dost thou, reverend defender of slavery render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's when thou seest Cæsar's impress on a coin of the realm? Look upon thy brother and read in him the image of thy God, and render unto thy Maker the things that are thy Maker's. [Loud applause.] I say to that Rev. Gentleman, hands off! If I am the man you are going to do good to by holding me as a slave, I must ask you how long you will live? Have you a specific antidote for appoplexy? Have you omniscience that you can avoid all the casualties of life? Do you never travel by the Eastern Counties Railway? Are you proof against the many ills that flesh is heir to? Do you wear a charmed life? Have you not even the infirmity of Achilles? Are you immortal? Because if I am to become your slave, my wife your slave, my children your slaves, my progeny for ever your slaves; though you are a very good man, I should like to see your proof of continual and perpetual prosperity. You make me a slave for my good; you die, and were am I? Were I free I might battle the waves of fortune: hating South Carolina I might walk into Pensylvania, or taking a fancy to go a little further might reach Buffalo, or the centre of the Niagara river: guided by the north star I might reach the domains of VICTORIA—where, looking back upon Egypt, I could say, 'I quit thee for ever and for aye.' [Loud applause.] Make a man a slave for his good! 'I will do it (said the Rev. gentleman) if you hoot me out of the hall.' Don't hoot such a man out of the hall. Christians of Norwich pray for him: pray that the eyes of his mind may be enlightened: pray that the Spirit of God may come upon him, that he may learn what that meaneth, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice.' To obey is better than sacrifice; to hearken than the fat of lambs. Owe no man anything; least of all owe him his liberty. Take not that which is not thine own: most of all forbear to take that which is thy God's.

> Oh! execrable son, to aspire
> Above his brother! to himself assuming
> Authority usurped, from God not given.

. . . . . In alluding to the slave-holders, he said, 'why do I call them man stealers? I never call them anything else; I can't call them robbers, because if I do so I should have to beg pardon of the highwayman, for classing him with such monsters. [Cheers and laughter.] There's only one expression that defines their crime—*man stealer*. I cannot put sheep stealer, loaf stealer, coat stealer, by the side of man stealer. Perish these garments. Perish all that's called good in the world; but leave me liberty. Liberty and a crust; friendless liberty; homeless liberty; disfranchised liberty, if you will, politically so, but give me personal liberty, let me call my wife my own, my children my own; when I close my hovel door, hovel though it be, let me know that it is sacred from the aggression of the Rev. man-stealer, who would make me a slave. [Applause.] Well, now listen; if ever your blood curdled in your veins it will be to-night. During the temporary absence of the Rev. Dr. Patton, of New York, from his church, the services of a slave-holding minister, the Rev. Mr. Somebody, were obtained, which circumstance was strongly animadverted upon by the editor of one of the New York papers, who also alluded to the invidious distinction made between the white and black worshipper, in the setting apart for the latter of what he denominated "the Jim Crow pew." Mr. Page, in a reply to these observations, thus vindicated the use of the obnoxious pew:—"As to what is said about the 'Jim Crow pew,' in Dr. Patton's church, I will remark that there are quite a number of them there, and very commodious ones too, situated not in 'the lowest room,' (mark the use of Scripture there,) but near the head of the table, close by the master of the ceremonies: indeed, they are placed conspicuously, right over the heads of the white worshippers; a little higher up towards heaven than even the pulpit itself; at Dr. P's. right hand, and near his heart, I have no doubt; there seated, just as the Son of God himself is seated, namely, on high." [Cries of shame, oh! shame, &c.] Now, a word about Mr. Clark. He arrived just two days before the Convention closed; he gave in his credentials in the morning, and in the afternoon he was with me: he remained with me several hours, during which time I criticised the proceedings of the Alliance, and he never expressed a word of dissent from what I stated, but throughout assented to my views. Put that against his assertion here, that he has promised to Dr. Cox, his dear father, that wherever he goes he will vindicate the course which the Alliance has taken on this question of slavery. Now, with regard to what Mr. Clark said, I affirm there's not an involuntary slave-holder in America. Take the case imagined; my father leaves me slaves: what then? Does my father make me a slave-holder? Nothing of the kind. Nothing can make me a slave-holder, but holding slaves myself. Your father leaves you a bag of money; you need not touch it, if you consider it the fruit of robbery. Where did your father get the slaves? How could he leave them to you, Rev. Sir? They never were his. Where's the

title-deed from the Almighty, empowering him to transmit them to you with his other parchment records? Has he got it? No. Can a lapse of years sanctify the crime? No. So that if they were descended from the first cargo discharged upon the banks of James' river, they were stolen goods, from that hour to the present. How dare you, Rev. Sir, take them from your father? Your father left you them, did he? You have a Father in heaven, Sir; did that Father leave them? That's the question. There's a limit, Sir, to filial obedience; there's a limit to the acquisition of property; I suppose, our friend will admit that when he looks behind on a Sunday at the Ten Commandments, "Thou shalt not steal," is one of them. And I tell him, that if he dare to take one of the slaves which his father left him, he is a robber of the first magnitude. Suppose his father left him me, [laughter,] and why not me? One father left Frederick Douglas to his son; and am I better than he? Am I better than the meanest wretch who with some blistered back, toils at this very hour on the rice plantation of an Episcopal Methodist Bishop. No. He has organs, senses, dimensions, passions like myself; a soul of infinite capacity like mine; and had I been born a slave, will that gentleman come here and tell me to my face, that he should have made me a slave? How could he enforce his right, if I said I won't be your slave? I am not your slave, I am free; free in soul, for thoughts are never to be sold; free to choose, and I'll take my choice. Do I choose slavery or fetters? I say fetters. Do you offer me slavery and good food; or rags, wretchedness, & starvation? Give me rags, give me starvation, give me wretchedness; and with my rags fluttering in the breeze, with God's free heaven above me, and God's free winds around me, and these free arms to labour, I'll go forth, nor thank you, Rev. Sir, for your paternal care. [Immense cheering.] Treat me kindly, will you? keep your kindness for your pigs, Sir; I'm a man. [Loud cheers.] You keep me, Sir? are you better than I? If you are, Sir, shew it me. Turn to your Bible and shew it me; your God teaches you in his word that he is no respecter of persons; that he has made of one blood all nations of men: that Ethiopia as well as England shall awaken and stretch out her hands to God: that he has his likeness stamped on every soul. Prove then, Sir, that I am not a man, or cease to claim me as your own. [Cheers.] Suppose I would not be a slave; how could he enforce my labour? Think of the Rev. gentleman with a whip in his hand and saying, 'I'll make you;' [laughter,] and mark, if he has a right to claim me, he has a right to enforce obedience. These poor wretches who are slaves cannot talk as I talk, but they will some day do it much better; and if they could not, O what eloquence there would be in their scars, their chafed and mangled limbs; aye what eloquence in that very stupidity to which they are condemned; for if there is a more eloquent lecture upon slavery in one form than in another, it is in the form of a man 'made a little lower than the angels' reduced by slavery, and imbruted to the lowest degree. Mr. Clark says that there are one hundred thousand Christian slave holders in America. I deny that there is one. I deny that Christian and slave holder can be put together. They have been called mere slave holders; let us see how that reads another way. He (Mr. Clowes) says, 'I would not exclude them, nor refuse to them the right hand of fellowship from the mere fact that they were slave holders. Let us see how this reads. Mere sheep stealers, [laughter,] mere adulterers; mere anything you please. I must not refuse to give the right hand of fellowship to a Christian brother from America, because he was a mere drunkard, a mere adulterer, a mere pirate, a mere extortioner. No; let this liberality be carried out and the right hand be given to the adulterer, to the notorious Sabbath-breaker, drunkard, sheep-stealer, and pirate. If he would not do this, tell me why he gives it to the slave-holder and man-stealer—the mere man-stealer. Why, in man-stealing, all crimes are centered; it is the all-comprising crime; crime against the soul, crime against the body, and crime against God. The man-stealer is every moment a robber; robbing, preaching and robbing; going to the Evangelical Alliance and robbing; expounding the Scriptures and robbing; for while he is preaching his slave is toiling, and his cry is passing through the ranks of Cherubim and Seraphim, and Angel and Archangel, and entering into the ears of the Lord of Sabbaoth. I will tell Mr. Clark that he had better stay in America rather than come to England till he has learned a better doctrine; for if I hate it, at one time more than at another, it is when it comes from the lips of a coloured man. Truly, my brother, from this platform I will say, brother, you have done the cause of your suffering fellow creatures harm in thus reconciling Christianity with slavery. Mr. Clark further says, that the slave-holders are involuntarily so. I deny it. They would get rid of slavery if they could. Sir, there are hundreds of young men educated in the colleges of the North—at Andover, at Yale college, at Princetown, New Jersey, at Cambridge, Massachusetts; hundreds of whom annually go forth to do nothing else but to marry women that are possessed of slaves; and they are the men, Sir, who come over to Evangelical Alliances and Bible Society platforms in this country. Now let us see who there are in the Southern States that could get rid of slaves. There are bishops. But you don't mean to say that there are slave-holding bishops in America? Yes, I do, and I'll read you an extract from a paper that has come to my hands this very day; it is from *the Western Christian Advocate*, a Wesleyan newspaper, published in the United States:—"The action of the Southern General Conference in selecting Drs. Capers and Paine for the episcopacy, speaks in favour of placing, in the most influential position in the church, slaveholders on the largest scale. Dr. Paine, we learn, has seventy-five slaves; and in order to attend to his planting interests, (as he would call overseering servants,) it is said he recently resigned his office as president of La Grange College in Alabama. Dr. Caper is a large slave-holder. Here the Southern Church has now three slave-holding bishops, ranking among the first class of slave-holders in Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama. This sanctifies slavery, of course. It is now certainly a *holy thing*. Slave-holding and *slave-breeding* are now sanctioned by the three *holiest men in the South*. They are not, it is true, such *petty slave-breeders*, as the *little breeders* of Virginia, and the more Northern slave States, who just have a few *selected breeders*. The new bishops have whole families which increase without any studied plan of slave-growing. Yet *slave-breeders* these bishops are, unless they will set the young progeny free: and this is not likely, because brother Crowder affectionately taught us all publicly, at Cincinnati, in 1836, that female slaves of Southern Methodist preachers are better clothed than the wives of Northern Methodist preachers." Now what prevents these bishops from giving up slave holding? are they involuntary slave holders? No. Are the heads of colleges, all of whom have slaves? No. Is there a man in the United States? No. I deny it; and I tell these gentlemen more; that they make excuses in St. Andrew's Hall for slavery, that are not made in the Southern States themselves. Every ecclesiastical body in the South, as I am prepared this moment to demonstrate, say that they hold their slaves because they have a sacred right to them, as *bona fide* property. Sir what have they to do? What did the angel say to Lot when sentence was pronounced upon the wicked cities, "Make haste, tarry not in all the plain lest thou be consumed." There are certain conditions in some States; you must give security that your emancipated slaves do not become chargeable on the funds of the State, or you must agree to take the slaves in twelve months out of the States, or they will be liable to be seized. These are not laws against emancipation, they are only conditions to be complied with. There is not a man living from the banks of the Colorado to the frontier of New Brunswick, that could not easily give up

slave holding to-morrow. Why they could settle it in a minute. Let us imagine a slave owner calling his slaves together: Sambo, Cæsar, Pompey, Julius, Sophonashi, and all the other fine names that they give to those beasts of burden, those human things, come here. Slave holding is a sin. I have not learned it from the Rev. Mr. Clowes, but from a lecture by the Rev. G. Thompson. [Laughter.] Now I emancipate you—you are all free, but stop, hear me, if you live in this city you are liable to be seized. I do not therefore see how I can avoid being a slave holder. I must keep you for your own good. "Tank you, Massa, we know something better dan dat." Give us free paper, Massa, and we'll go by the north star and wish you good bye." [Laughter.] There's no difficulty with the slave, he knows his way out. It is this, enlightened Christian, that does not see his way out, but how passing strange that in this 19th century, a clear-sighted gentleman in England does not see his way out. Why any man can cease to commit sin, by ceasing to commit sin. [Laughter.] Say to the slaves, you are free, you have twelve months to get out of the state. Why they wont be twelve hours. I undertake to say that the necessary conditions can always be complied with; but I would direct your attention to the fact, that one of those laws would be powerless, for in the event of a man emancipating his slaves—if a man proclaims to the world that he acknowledges those who were once his slaves, as his brethren, the seizure of half a dozen of those slaves might follow, but it would kindle up the public fury throughout the country, and in the first act of inflicting its penalty, it would bring itself to extermination. [Cheers.] The speaker then referred to the fallicious notion that slavery ought not to be sought to be suddenly abolished, but that gradual emancipation should take place. Gradual emancipation! Why they have had 70 years to do it in, Since the trumpet of independence was sounded. They proudly wrote a practical lie on their flag. "God hath their own declaration. Gradual emancipation! It is created all men free and equal," they lie against a device of the evil one. Does God say, quit stealing gradually, quit drunkenness gradually, quit poligamy gradually, have 50 wives to-day and 49 to-morrow? Gradual emancipation! Gradual running away from the devil. [Laughter.] Knocking off a link a day of an endless chain. Very profitable work that; very beautiful doctrine, admirably sublime, gradual emancipation! Why? It is bad or it is good, sin or no sin. If it is a righteous institution, why abolish it at all? Mr. Thompson last touched upon the argument of the prosperous state of the slave churches, which had been often advanced by those who were unfavourable to his views, and alluded further to the incompatibility of Christianity and slavery. He read also the following extract from a volume of Sermons, published for the use of slaves, by Bishop Meade:—

"Now, when *correction* is given you, you either deserve it, or you do not deserve it. But whether you really deserve it or not, it is your duty, and Almighty God requires that you bear it patiently. You may, perhaps, think that this is hard doctrine, but if you consider it right, you must needs think otherwise of it. Suppose then, that you deserve correction, you cannot but say that it is just and right you should meet with it. Suppose you do not, or at least you do not deserve so much, or so severe a correction for the fault you have committed, you perhaps have escaped a great many more, and are at last paid for all. Or suppose you are quite innocent of what is laid to your charge, and suffer wrongfully, in that particular thing, is it not possible you may have done some other bad thing, which was never discovered; and that Almighty God, who saw you doing it, would not let you escape without punishment one time or another, and ought you not, in such a case, to give glory to him, and be thankful that he would rather punish you in this life, for your wickedness than destroy your souls for it in the next life? But suppose that even this was not the case (a case hardly to be imagined) and that you have by no means, known or unknown, deserved the correction you suffered, there is this great comfort in it, that if you bear it patiently, and leave your cause in the hands of God he will reward you for it in Heaven, and the punishment you suffer unjustly here, shall turn to your exceedinly great glory hereafter."

He concluded by a reference to the inconsistent conduct of those who complained of the laws, which, they alleged, prevented emancipation. He said, they resembled a little girl who was once called from one room into another. "I can't come," said the little girl. "Why can't you?" inquired her mamma. "Because my leg is tied to the table." "And who tied your leg to the table, my love?" "I did, mamma." [Laughter.] "O, we can't abolish slavery," say the slave-holders. And why can't you? Because the laws won't let us. And who made the laws? yes, who made the laws? my reverend friend. We made the laws. [Laughter.] Then away with your subterfuge, and unmake your laws. [Loud cheers.] After thanking his audience for the patient hearing they had given him, the speaker sat down amidst long continued applause.

Mr. Brock was sorry that, at that late period of the evening, they could not have the opportunity of hearing their good friend Mr. Daly, who he was heartily desirous should obtain a hearing. And he was quite as sorry that the Rev. Mr. Reed would, from the same cause, not be able to address them. He rose, however, to say that previous to Mr. Clowes' leaving the meeting, he requested him (Mr. Brock) to do in reference to him what, under the circumstances, was due to his character; and he now felt that he would not be doing his duty to that excellent clergyman, were he not to say that a more pious man, a more exemplary Christian, or a more thorough-going and worthy minister of the gospel it was never his happiness to become acquainted with. He had also to say, that he had the pleasure of being acquainted with Mr. Geo. Thompson for a period of ten years, and a more generous, kind-hearted or candid opponent he never knew. He was sure, therefore, that Mr. Thompson would do a good thing, and say again what he had already said. Mr. Clowes had come there as an apologist for an abstract thing. He took up a position unhappily without regarding its practical consequences, but of this he was quite sure that a better man never breathed he air of heaven, and a more faithful minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ never existed.

Mr. Thompson responding to the call made upon him said that he had such perfect confidence in his Rev. friend behind him (Mr. Brock) that he had not the slightest hesitation in believing every statement which he had made in reference to Mr. Clowes. For his own part he had only to say that in the remarks which he felt it his duty to make, he made no reference to Mr. Clowes personally, [hear, hear,] he merely put forward a principle, stated a case, and expressed an opinion; and with that principle, with that case, and with that opinion only had he to deal. While dealing with them he referred to Mr. Clowes, but he only did that for the purpose of identifying the source whence those doctrines came which he opposed, and he had merely to say that he was incapable of giving that gentleman any intentional offence, or saying any thing which might be derogatory to him. [Hear, hear.] He was always accustomed to speak plainly, and it might be his misfortune, that he did not always separate with sufficient distinctness, the objects of his denunciation from those who were personally bound up with them, and he hoped if he did not do so on the present occasion, that the meeting would do it for him. He had in conclusion to say, that he had no objection to their cherishing the strong-

est feeling of esteem for the Rev. gentleman but he would recommend them to look well to what he said when he spoke on the question of slavery. [Cheers.]

Rev. A. Reed in rising to propose a vote of thanks to the sheriff said, that had time permitted (it was then half-past 10 o'clock) he should have been happy to make a few remarks on that occasion, and to allow his name to go forth in connection with that great question. He would only say that the prostration of Christianity in connection with slavery, should not be tolerated, and however desirable a christian union might be, it was not to be brought about by this unholy continuation. By such an alliance, a stigma would be cast on their christianity, and though it might present the appearance of harmony and strength, it was based upon an unrighteous foundation, and could not be permanent. [Cheers.] He anticipated good results, however, from what had occurred, as it showed that some preparatory steps were necessary before any solid or useful ends could be accomplished, and nothing could be effected unless purity formed one of the ingredients of their union. [Cheers.] He would conclude by proposing a vote of thanks to the Sheriff, for his proper conduct in the chair. [Cheers.]

Mr. Geo. Thompson, in introducing Mr. Daily (the coloured gentleman) to second the motion, said that he had known him for some time past, and he could vouch that he was one of the oldest and most worthy of the abolitionists of slavery in the United States. [Cheers.] And he was neither ashamed nor unwilling to avow his sentiments upon both sides of the Potomac. [Cheers.] He was, at present, on a visit to this country, and he came down from London to that meeting as his companion. One coloured gentleman had been heard in that hall, and he hoped they would now hear another on the question of slavery. [Hear, hear.]

Mr. Daly then came forward to the front of the platform, and was received with loud cheers. Before he proceeded to read a few notes, which he had in manuscript before him, he begged to return his sincere thanks to the meeting for the kind reception they had given him, and to his good friend Mr. G. Thompson for the manner in which he had spoken of him. He was glad to have the opportunity of confirming all that he had said on the subject of slavery. [Cheers.] It was nothing but the truth, and not one millioneth part of the truth had been told. [Cheers.] He himself was born in one of the southern states—in the state of Virginia—and were he to disclose the horrors and atrocities perpetrated in the prison houses there, he would, to use the words of their own Shakspeare, "make their hair stand on end, like the quills of the fretful porcupine." The speaker here felt such emotion as to be unable to proceed; and Mr. G. Thompson intimated to the meeting that Mr. Daly's notes would appear in *The Norfolk News* next morning. An arrangement acceptable, from the lateness of the hour, both to Mr. Daly and the audience.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen—Having convinced the hard hearted tyrants themselves, that slavery is contrary to every principle of natural justice, of humanity, of duty, of christianity, and common honesty, and wrung even from them the admission that they are opposed to slavery in the abstract, have now to meet a most anomalous, dangerous and formidable foe, the clerical apologist of the slaveholder, in supporting the most infamous system that a relentless and tyrannical majority ever inflicted upon a defenceless and unoffending minority, a system which sanctions the breeding human beings for the market; which hourly exposes God's image on the shambles to the highest bidder; which separates for life, the nearest and dearest ties; which licenses lust and incest, which prevents marriage—and excludes the bible from perishing millions who have souls to be saved. Is he not an ecclesiastical anomaly, who is found arrayed against the very gospel he is sent to teach? What difference is there between the Judas Iscariot, who betrayed his master's person, and he who betrays his master's principles: who, instead of making such an ostentatious bluster, and parade of professed love, should be a living illustration of the practical application of the maxim, "words are but wind, actions are the test of principle." Is not he a more formidable and dangerous enemy, who approaches us in the mantled sanctity of the gospel? The attributes of peace on earth, and good will to man, whose duty it is to teach the law of universal brotherhood: "love thy neighbour as thyself" "Do to others that ye would others should do unto you." "Undo the heavy burdens, break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free," is found siding with the oppressor against the oppressed, by perverting the scripture to rivet the chains of the slave! Well has the great master of the passions pourtrayed this species of hypocrite, as one

"Who stole the livery of the Court
Of Heaven, to serve the devil in."

The slave holder is consistent in his tyranny. The clerical hypocrite out-clamours the most violent abolitionist in his denunciations of slave holding, and, in his holy indignation, considers it the vilest of all sins; but affects to be overtaken with a sudden blindness, when pointed by the clearer vision of the abolitionist to the inseparable identical oneness of sin and sinner. It is this tantalizing ecclesiastic, who is worse than the cow that gives a good pail of milk and then kicks it over; who promises freedom to the ear, and breaks it to the hope; who says that, but for the abolitionists, slavery would have been abolished, in the face of voluminous evidence to the contrary—that if emancipation is hastened by the abolitionists, civil wars will ensue, far exceeding in bloody consequences those involving the rival conflicts of York and Lancaster. But enough. I want words to characterize, in proper terms, the utter meanness of one, and such is Dr. Samuel H. Cox, who, by the prostitution of the most pre-eminent talents, is doing the devil's work in the service of the slave-holder, at the expense of down-trodden humanity; manifesting more love for his salary than the work of his Lord and master Jesus Christ; reviving in Liverpool the stale, flat, and absurd dogmas that were the last hope and refuge of the terrified West India body; who were driven before the British abolitionists like the Roman army before the advance of Hannibal, behind the Parthian mountains, there to hide their diminished heads. Theories that have been scouted by the very boys in the streets—trifles beneath the soldier's heeding—advanced at this age of sober realities to fright the isle from its propriety. Alas! what a contrast are the Doctor's present pretensions to the motto of his banner in 1836:

"Homo sum nil humani a me alienum puto."

Surely the maxim, "Whom the gods intend to destroy they first make mad," is no unfit emblem of the Doctor's infirmity. After all, however, there is a method in the Doctor's madness in deferring the explosion of his divine hatred, or, if he prefers Latin, *odium Theologicum*, till his arrival in Liverpool; for according to them, the elder Liverpool (the very bricks and mortar of whose houses are cemented with the blood of the African,) is as worthy of the slave holder or his apologist as either are of the town: but the cowardly wisdom of the doctor lay in the attempt to assassinate the private character of Mr. Garrison, at a distance, instead of in London, which he had frequent and ample opportunity of doing. While I am happy at the escape of the doctor from the terrible demolition he would have sustained from a well fortified Garrison, I regret for the sake of justice and humanity, the rencontre did not transpire in London, as I was present at the meeting at Exeter Change, when all persons, without distinction, were invited to speak out their sentiments freely. A member of the Evangelical Alliance took advantage of the invitation, but before he finished, placed the Alliance in a most unenviable plight, not to use a harsher expression. Now where

is the difference between Dr. Cox and the abolitionists on the subject of Slavery. I know Mr. Garrison from his early life, when he first consecrated his youth to the cause of freedom, from which he has never swerved, but has been as true to the cause of the oppressed as the needle to the pole; his life has been one of self sacrifice, intense and ardent devotion to the cause he so early espoused. Mr. Garrison is not mealy mouthed —choosing the rather, not to mince matters, to suit those who wish to perpetuate slavery; but prefers to call things by their right names—preferring the truth—believing firmly that it would ultimately prevail over error; he has never personally attacked any one, but when visited by the vilest calumny and abuse which the tongue of envy could invent, and pressed by the overwhelming combination of wealth and power, he was from the conscious rectitude of his intentions, compelled to; what wonder he should have dealt back blows harder than his antagonists desired in their dismay and discomfiture. He is also accused of retarding emancipation, by his violence of language. Now, need I ask if any system so needs strong words to describe its enormity, and if the Reformer is not required to make his language proportionate to the enormity against which it is directed. But the opponents of Mr. Garrison, finding it difficult to meet his arguments, have set up the cry of infidel, &c., which is insulting to the understanding of the British people. What had Mr. G's. peculiar religious opinion, if he entertains any, to do with his views on the subject of slavery? In fact, he does not require the American people to square their principles by Christianity? He goes for the immediate unconditional, and complete emancipation of the bondman from involuntary bondage, and to receive, in lieu, compensation for his labour—that the present relation is one of robbery and flagrant injustice, that there can be no sin without a sinner—and that it is the duty of the sinner not to delay repentance to a remote convenience, but to repent immediately—my sympathies are not with that clergyman who would persecute the advocate of such a creed. There is nothing but the potent nay omnipotent influence of the slave-power that prevents all creeds from uniting in the removal of slavery. Slavery is calculated to blind more men then Dr. Cox; and if I have said anything harsh of him, it is not from any personal dislike, not that I love him less, but liberty more. It may be asked, what I have to do with slavery, being born free? I used to think Mr. Garrison too violent, but when I came to feel the iron enter my soul, that the reflex influence of southern slavery upon the free coloured man at the north made his condition, if any, but a slight remove from that of the slave. If any one wishes to know what slavery can do with a man, let them hear the true but simple statements of my worthy friend, Frederick Douglass. I am not here to defend Mr. Garrison, he can do that much better himself, but I feel it my duty to testify from experience to the portion of people in the United States, who have stood up through every peril in favour of the oppressed, that they embody the moral worth of the country, and are behind none for integrity of purpose, and for purity and uprightness of character. But it is asked, what can be done in England to aid in effecting the removal of American Slavery. I reply, simply to cease fraternising with the clerical apologist of the slave-holder, and thus make slave holding unfashionable. It were a pity to compromise the great principle of West India emancipation, by encouragement of American Slavery The people of colour in the United States, beg this at the hands of the British people; if this is done, a virtuous and indignant public sentiment will be aroused that will make slave-holders ashamed of slave-holding, and the prayers of 3,000,000 of people will ascend up to heaven for the boon. If I have disappointed the expectations of this highly respectable audience, I beg respectfully to say it is the first time I ever addressed an audience, and what I have said was partly pencilled in the carriage on my way to this town, and part in this Hall, and that I have not gotten over the excitement consequent upon the few days I have been in England, and the first time in my life my feet ever trod the soil of a free country. I thank, you, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen, for your indulgence, I shall ever remember this as the proudest moment of my life. I have expressly omitted to say any thing about myself. On this subject rest the emotions of a bosom that has felt the iron pierce to its inmost recesses.

The Rev. T. Scott thought, before the meeting separated, that a vote of thanks should be given to the Rev. Mr. Brock, for calling them together on that occasion. He conceived that the course which the Rev. gentleman had adopted, was one which the circumstances of the case required. The impression left on peoples' minds, at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, held in that Hall, on that day week, was one which demanded a demonstration like the present, and he rejoiced that an opportunity was given to the people of Norwich to express their sentiments on the subject of American Slavery. [Hear, hear.] What Mr. Clark intended to say he was unable to tell, but what he did say was, that slave holding and Christianity were compatible; and that the slave holders, in America, were so circumstanced as to be obliged to retain their slaves in their possession. He (Mr. Scott) felt thankful to Mr. Brock for the opportunity which he afforded to the citizens of Norwich, to express their burning and thrilling hated of slavery, in all its forms. [Cheers.]

Rev. A. Reed seconded the motion, which was agreed to unanimously, as was also the vote of thanks to the Sheriff.

The Chairman and Mr. Brock having re' ned thanks,

Mr. Thompson proposed three cheers for the total and immediate abolition of slavery, which were given with deafening reality.

A cheer having been given for "George Thompson," the meeting separated at 11 o'clock.

Patriot Oct 1. 1846

THE ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.

Sir,—I am rejoiced that the movement on behalf of the oppressed in America is exciting inquiry. Inquiry will elicit truth; and the establishment and triumph of truth is all that is sought by the Anti Slavery League. I make these remarks in relation to your Islington correspondent "Inquirer," who, in a short letter, makes as many gratuitous assumptions and flippant insinuations as it is possible for one to make within the same space. It is in the first place assumed, that we have "a very effective organisation in the Anti Slavery Society." "Inquirer" will no doubt be prepared to prove this position. On this point he is not an inquirer, for he has no doubt about it, and the public will expect him to make good his assertion. Meanwhile, the Anti-Slavery League will lose no time in justifying itself as a distinct organisation. Then follows an inquiry, viz., "whether the League is to give its sanction to the proceedings adopted by those who act in concert with Mr. Lloyd Garrison in America?" To which I reply, that the League fully concurs in all the steps taken by the American Anti-Slavery Society, of which Mr. Garrison is president, and which includes the persons referred to by "Inquirer." The next question we take the liberty of reversing, and ask our "Inquirer," "on what principle such persons as the Tappans, Mr.

Leavett, Mr. Phelps, and Mr. Arnold Buffam, form a party distinct from Mr. Garrison?" This is the logical order of the question; it being always understood that reasons for separation properly devolve upon the dissentients.

The only other point at which I shall now glance is the last sentence of "Inquirer's" letter, in which he first states that he hates American slavery. Let him give me the proof. But he adds that there are other things he hates, to say the least, quite as much. Let him name them. American slavery involves robbery, concubinage, incest, hypocrisy, heathenism, lying, woman whipping, sacrilege. blasphemy, and murder! "Inquirer," tell me what you hate "quite as much?"

I am, Sir, yours very respectfully,

R. SMITH,

Secretary to the League.

1, Guildhall Chambers, Sept. 28, 1846.

THE REV. M. M. CLARKE AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

SIR,—I hasten to inform your readers that I have received from the Rev. M. M. Clarke a distinct declaration, that he is, in no wise, the advocate of American Slavery. His language is most solemn and explicit; and I think myself bound, in justice to Mr. Clarke, to ask you to insert his letter in your next Number. When the report of his speech shall be obtained in full, it will be seen whether the Norwich people misapprehend him or not. That he was generally understood to defend American Slavery, even as I represented in my last letter, is beyond all doubt. The expression of disapprobation, on that account, led to his being called to order, when he sat down.

If injustice has been done to Mr. Clarke, I, for one, am ready to offer him any acknowledgements of regret, and my assurances of readiness to repair the injury in any way within my power.

We have a public meeting on Friday next, to which Mr. G. Thompson is coming, in order to inform the public of the true nature of American Slavery.

I much regret that I called Mr. Clarke's speech a formal defence of Americal Slavery. It was rather a defence of the American slaveholder.

I am, yours truly,

WILLIAM BROCK.

Norwich, Tuesday.

My dear Brother,—For so, I trust, you will allow me to call you, as a minister of Christ. In answer to your note of Saturday night, I beg to acquaint you, that, before I came to Norwich, arrangements had been made for my attendance at a public meeting in Buckinghamshire to morrow; you will thus see that I cannot stay for the meeting to which you have kindly invited me on Friday night. I am, however, unfeignedly anxious not to be the occasion of any impression unfavourable to the Anti-slavery cause being left upon the minds of the inhabitants of Norwich. I, therefore, purpose taking, this evening, at Calvert-street Chapel (where I have engaged to conduct the public service), the only opportunity now open to me of stating publicly some facts explanatory of my own position and views in relation to this subject. As a Christian and a stranger I was grieved I was not invited to call on you, as I think I could have given you perfect satisfaction to what I stated in the meeting of last week.

As a coloured man, and as a pastor in a slave state, over a church of coloured men, part of whom are slaves, I am experiencing every day and every hour the oppressive and crushing influence of the detestable system of slavery. Whatever may be the exceptions (and which do not deserve to be named) the universal rule is, oppression of the whole man—soul and body. From what I have experienced in my own person and feelings (although never myself a slave), I can be anything sooner than be a friend in any shape or form to that odious and inhuman system. If, therefore, any word or expression which you may have heard me utter should have conveyed an impression contrary to that, I hope you will have the Christian charity to believe it a mistake of my head or tongue, and not of my heart, designing to palliate in the least degree that oppressive system.

Begging an interest in your prayers,

I remain, dear Brother,

Your fellow-servant in the Gospel of Christ,

M. M. CLARKE.

September 28th, 1846.

Patriot Oct 1. 1846

DEATH OF THOMAS CLARKSON, ESQ.

(From the *Times*.)

In the early part of the present century no questions of legislation entered more deeply into the thoughts, or more extensively influenced the feelings, of the people of England than the measures then proposed for the abolition of the Slave trade. The leaders in that extraordinary movement have created for themselves reputations which in the course of two generations have scarcely yet faded, and which probably will not sink into oblivion for a still longer period than that during which celebrities of their class usually enjoy distinction and fame. Those who followed in the extreme rear of the party were unquestionably sincere, while those who led the vanguard were equally under the influence of noble and disinterested motives; and whatever reproach may attach to "the bustling botherbys" who occupied the intermediate space—whatever may be thought of the humanity-mongers who could sympathise with none but negroes, and who aspired to be prominent without deserving to be leaders, there can be no doubt that the name of Thomas Clarkson will always be regarded with respect, and will descend to a remote posterity associated with those of the most distinguished philanthropists which this country has produced.

The subject of the present notice was the son of a gentleman who held the situation of master of the Wisbeach Free Grammar-school. He was born on the 28th of March, 1760, and was, therefore, at the time of his death, in the 87th year of his age. Having received the first rudiments of education under his father's eye, he was removed to St. Paul's-school, and completed the days of his pupilage at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he attained considerable distinction. In the year 1785 Dr. Peckhard was Vice-Chancellor of the University, and he announced to the senior Bachelors of Arts the following question, as a subject for a prize Latin dissertation:—"Is it right to make slaves of others against their will?" Mr. Clarkson, in the preceding year, gained the first prize for the Latin dissertation; and, filled with an earnest desire to sustain the fame thus acquired, he repaired to London, and purchased as many books connected with the subject of slavery as he could possibly afford to buy. With these he speedily returned to Cambridge, and set himself earnestly to the work of preparing to

indite his essay. But so painful to him was the perusal of these volumes, that, for a considerable time, he scarcely took any rest day or night; he ceased to regard the essay as a mere trial for literary distinction, his great desire being to produce a work which should call forth a vigorous public effort to redress the wrongs of the injured African. His essay was composed under the influence of feeling so excited, and with labour so intense, that when his acknowledged talents are taken into account, no one will be surprised to learn that its reading was attended with brilliant success. Even at that early period of his life he seemed to have been carried away by the conviction that it was the duty of some individual to devote his life to a crusade against African slavery; the thought grew upon him from day to day, and he could no longer keep his mind at rest. It is well known that long before the time of Thomas Clarkson, several persons belonging to the Society of Friends made large pecuniary sacrifices, and exerted their personal influence, as well as their literary talents, in the cause to which the subject of this memoir devoted his entire life; but these circumstances detract nothing from the reputation that he has earned. No successful attempt can be made to show that any other than he was the originator of that system of agitation which led to the well-known measures for the suppression of the Slave-trade. Much may be said of Burley, of Sandeford, of Lay, of Woolman, of Churchman, of Benezet, of Dillwynn, of Godwyn, of Wesley, of Whitfield, of Ramsay, and even of Granville Sharpe; but previous to the time of Clarkson no commanding or masterly effort had been made. In a very short time after the prize for his Latin essay on slavery had been awarded to him he adopted the resolution of presenting it to the public in the language of his native country, and the measures taken for printing and issuing that celebrated tract led to his becoming acquainted with some members of an Anti-slavery Association, which had already been formed in America. Nothing could surpass the delight which this introduction seemed to have afforded him; he was enthusiastic and single-minded, as almost all men are who effect great objects; his one idea was to accomplish measures for suppressing the Slave-trade, and that result he had the good fortune to witness full forty years ago. Its natural consequence, an abolition of negro slavery, he had likewise the happiness to see effected in the year 1836. Of course, in the progress of his labours the number of his acquaintances rapidly augmented; and so contagious was the influence of the spirit which animated him, that Hannah More wrote on the subject of slavery one of those pieces of stilted prose, which, by courtesy, is called a poem. But, passing by all these minor connexions, we find him, many years before the consummation of the work in which he had engaged, forming an alliance with the much more celebrated William Wilberforce—an alliance which proved greatly conducive to their joint success. With respect to those eminent persons, it may be stated, that two years before Clarkson broached the subject to Wilberforce, he had been actively labouring for the suppression of the Slave-trade; and that the attention of the latter was first called to its enormities by the representations of the former. In reviewing the weighty and successful toils of these men, it becomes extremely difficult to repress a feeling of regret, that the extraordinary abilities and perseverance applied by them to the relief of half human savages—the natives of a distant continent—could have found in this our native island no objects of sympathy—no field for philanthropic labours. The horrors of the middle passage were to their imaginations more fearful than the horrors to which the white slaves of England were exposed. It is, however, only fair to the memories of Clarkson and Wilberforce to admit, that, in their days, there were no union workhouses—no commissioners at Somerset-house; and it is, perhaps, not too partial an estimate of their characters to assume that if they had lived in this our day, they would have postponed the claims of the African to those of the Englishman; and that, however just and necessary it might be to relieve the British name and the British Government from the deep disgrace of trading in human flesh, yet, doubtless, they would have felt that they were under a still more stringent obligation to let the interests of the dusky barbarian wait upon the just claims of our own oppressed, though civilised and Christian countrymen.

From the moment that Wilberforce and Clarkson first met, they proceeded in perfect unison, and they soon secured the co-operation of many men influenced by the same feelings, but not sustained by the same intellectual vigour. In the year 1787, Mr. Wilberforce agreed to bring the subject under the notice of Parliament, at the earliest convenient opportunity; a Committee was formed for the purpose of organising an Association, and the work began in right earnest. Somewhat in the manner of the modern agitators, the subject of this memoir went about from town to town—from Liverpool to Bristol, and from Bridgewater to Manchester, labouring to make converts, and to overcome the prejudices which indifferent, as well as interested parties, naturally indulged. Years were spent in this process, books were published, meetings were held, evidence was collected, petitions were forwarded to Parliament, successive motions were made by Mr. Wilberforce, and lengthened discussions in the House of Commons took place; but neither Pitt nor Fox was yet prepared to pledge himself irrevocably to a conflict with those formidable opponents of suppression who had embarked vast capital in the African Slave-trade. At length the objections of the party leaders were mitigated. Mr. Pitt became instrumental in bringing forward a discussion, though he abstained from expressing any decided opinion; and the House of Commons resolved, that in the ensuing session of Parliament they would proceed to a careful investigation of the Slave-trade. Petitions on the other side were numerously signed and forwarded to both Houses of Parliament, and the whole progress of the agitation went on as nearly as possible in the manner that Roman Catholic Emancipation, and the great measure of Reform, were in their respective periods of our history discussed by the people of England and their Parliamentary representatives. In this process the Slave-trade underwent a most searching investigation. Mr. Clarkson and others published numerous essays, pamphlets, and reports. The Privy Council entered into an examination of the subject, and made a report. Counsel were heard at the bars of both Houses, and witnesses were carefully examined. In the course of these proceedings every one must acknowledge that the labours of Clarkson were inconceivably great; but, from the year 1789 down to the successful issue of his toils, Wilberforce, from his position in society, from the fact of his being in Parliament, and from his personal intimacy with the Prime Minister, was enabled to take a lead in the Anti-slavery cause which rather eclipsed the otherwise brightening fame of Thomas Clarkson; nevertheless, he continued to labour with power undiminished and with zeal that never slackened. He even went to Paris in the midst of the revolution, to obtain, if possible, the aid of the French Government; and though recommended to assume a feigned name

and disguise his purpose, yet, strong in the righteousness of his mission, he took the more manly course of proceeding direct to his object. He found, however, that in Paris he had spent a long time to little purpose, and he began to discover that the goal which he had hoped speedily to reach was day by day receding from his view; that the cause which he supported was liable to frequent vicissitudes, and that, like every other portion of human affairs, it seemed to ebb and flow; now to be on the point of a triumphant conclusion, and the next moment descending to the lowest point of depression. At this period of Mr. Clarkson's life it was thought by Mr. Wilberforce that his opulent friends should join him in a subscription to purchase an annuity for one who had devoted his whole existence, and spent a considerable portion of his moderate property, in advancing a public cause. Mr. Wilberforce proceeded in this matter with the utmost delicacy and good feeling; but, unfortunately, not with that entire success with which so generous a purpose deserved to be crowned. This particular and comparatively minor subject has, since then, given rise to a prodigious mass of controversy, a mere abstract of which would occupy the space properly belonging to subjects of more enduring interest.

Notwithstanding the labours of Wilberforce and Clarkson, the Slave-trade at the close of the last century still continued to exist; but in the year 1801 the union with Ireland was finally accomplished; and, as the members who represented that part of the kingdom were not much interested in either ships, colonies, or commerce, they cared but little about the Slave-trade, and were not averse from any sort of change which did not directly interfere with their favourite pursuit of jobbing in Government patronage. By their aid a motion for leave to bring in a Bill to suppress the Slave-trade was successful, and, eventually, the measure passed both Houses. Some years, however, elapsed before the triumph of the anti-slavery party was complete, for this memorable measure did not become law until the 25th of March, 1807. A history of the remarkable and protracted struggle which thus terminated was, soon afterwards, undertaken by Mr. Clarkson, and published in two volumes. This history and other parts of the publications and proceedings of Mr. Clarkson have been noticed at some length in the life of Mr. Wilberforce, written by his sons. Upon the observations made in that work Mr. Clarkson published copious strictures, and the relative merits of Clarkson and Wilberforce have given rise of late years to much discussion, carried on with considerable warmth; but having already expressed our reluctance to engage in that controversy, it only remains to be added, that though Bills were passed by the Parliament of Great Britain which were intended to effect a suppression of the trade in African slaves, much more yet remained to be effected; that though the subject of this notice no longer toiled like a slave to put an end to slavery, yet even in the year 1807 he did not cease to be a public man; and though the Catholic Association was dissolved in 1829, the Political Unions in 1832, and the Anti-Corn-law League in 1846, yet the combined labours of Clarkson and his friends did by no means cease in 1807; but, on the contrary, continued with most conspicuous activity, and even to the present hour their vitality is not extinguished. But the Bill of 1807 having once received the Royal Assent, it no longer was necessary for Mr. Clarkson to appear before the public as the author of so many pamphlets, reports, statements, and annotations. The amount of correspondence which it was necessary for him to carry on became sensibly diminished; he had not so many private conferences to hold, not so much evidence to collect or witnesses to bring together, not so many petitions or resolutions to draw up, not so many conflicting opinions to reconcile, and therefore he might be said to have enjoyed, during the remainder of his long life, something like comparative repose. It was at that time he began and completed his history of the great struggle in which he and his friends had been engaged. Thirty years after the publication of that work, he was accused of having devoted too much of its pages to the praise of his own labours at the expense of his great Parliamentary leader, Mr. Wilberforce. He lived long enough to publish a defence of his conduct and his writings; it becomes, therefore, the less necessary now to vindicate either. However eminent the reputation of Mr. Wilberforce, and however great beyond those of all other men the services which he rendered to the cause of the suffering negro, there cannot be much doubt, that Clarkson originated the Anti-Slavery agitation, and proved himself the most zealous and efficient of those who, outside the walls of Parliament, laboured for its advancement.

The subject of this memoir was, it is understood, originally intended for the church, and even took deacon's orders; but he certainly abandoned all thoughts of entering upon any profession when he devoted himself to the task of creating the anti-slavery movement. In forming the association which gave him the great business of his life, he came much into communication with persons belonging to the Society of Friends, and this intercourse probably led him to produce a work entitled "A Portraiture of Quakerism." His next publication was a life of William Penn. But, notwithstanding his literary engagements, he still had time to spare for the further advancement of African interests. He went to the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, and there had an interview with the Emperor of Russia, who promised not only to oppose the slave-trade by the exercise of his own authority, but to use his influence with other sovereigns for the purpose of inducing them to go and do likewise.

Although in the course of this notice it has been necessary to mention the combined labours of the friends of abolition, outside the walls of Parliament, as those of an anti-slavery society, yet that precise designation was, we believe, for the first time assumed in 1823, when men began seriously and earnestly to devote themselves to the task of following up the suppression of the Slave-trade, by procuring an abolition of West India slavery. In conducting the affairs of that association Mr. Clarkson embarked with characteristic energy, and in the 74th year enjoyed the unalloyed happiness of witnessing its greatest triumph, in the enactment of that Bill which awarded 20,000,000*l.* as compensation to the slave-owners. For some few years previous to that event, however, his health had become uncertain, and he was in a great degree precluded from taking an active share in working out the emancipation of the negro. Cataract formed in both his eyes, and for a short time he was totally blind. He endured this affliction with Christian resignation; but eventually he underwent an operation, and was restored to the complete use of his sight. In 1836, he published a work called "Researches Antediluvian, Patriarchal, and Historical." During the course of his long life Mr. Clarkson has received many gratifying proofs of the estimation in which he was held by large masses of his countrymen. The inhabitants of Wisbeach, his native place, subscribed for his portrait, to be preserved in their town as a memorial of their esteem. Wordsworth devoted to the praise of Clarkson a few of his best lines, and more than once Lord Brougham, and other leaders of the anti-slavery movement, have borne testimony, not only to the value of his services, but the purity of his motives; and he now descends into the grave after the enjoyment of extreme longevity and unexampled suc-

Patriot Oct 5. 1846 89

GREAT ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING, NORWICH.

TO REVIEW THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE IN CONNEXION WITH AMERICAN SLAVERY.

In consequence of certain statements made at a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in this city, last week, by the Rev. M. M. Clarke, of America, in justification of American slaveholders, a special meeting was called for Friday evening, at St. Andrew's-hall, for the purpose of affording an opportunity of refuting them. St. Andrew's-hall was filled by a highly respectable audience of nearly 2,000 persons. This numerous assemblage was attracted not only by the interest involved in the subject to come before the meeting, but by the presence of the distinguished advocate of freedom and human rights, Mr. George Thompson. Soon after half past six o'clock, the Sheriff came on the platform, accompanied by Mr. Thompson, the Rev. Mr Brock, and other gentlemen; and having taken the chair, briefly stated the purpose for which the meeting was convened, and called on the Rev. Mr. Brock to commence the proceedings.

Mr. Brock came forward, and spoke at considerable length. He detailed what occurred at the Evangelical Alliance on Friday week, when the Rev. M. M. Clarke had spoken in vindication of a certain class of slaveholders. On that occasion he (Mr. Brock) was not permitted to put a few questions to the rev. gentleman, which might, perhaps, have obviated the necessity of the present meeting. He then read a correspondence which had passed between them, and which fully absolved Mr. Clarke from any participation in the sin of slavery; but, nevertheless, the impression of his spoken speech on many minds was such as fully to authorise him (Mr. Brock) in taking the course he had adopted. Mr. Brock then went into the general question of American slavery, the iniquity of which he established by copious evidence from the writings of Harriet Martineau, Charles Dickens, and from other authors and sources. The rev. gentleman, who spoke with great earnestness, was loudly applauded throughout, and at the close of his address,

The Rev. Thomas Clowes came forward for the purpose of vindicating Mr. Clarke's speech, which he contended did not bear the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Brock. He maintained that there was no difference between them on the subject of American slavery in the abstract. Mr. Clarke, who had introduced the subject, did not, in his (Mr. Clowes' mind) express himself very fluently or clearly; yet his impression was that he (Mr. Clarke) disclaimed in so many words the slightest sympathy with the system of slavery or its principles: he (Mr. Clowes) might be in error, but this was his decided impression; and further, that under certain circumstances there might be certain slaveholders who were such involuntarily, and therefore to be treated as Christian brethren: he (Mr. Clarke) was in fact trying to show that men might be Christian brethren who supported slavery. (A cry, "impossible," followed by cheers.) Here a gentleman rose in the hall, and asked Mr. Clowes to explain the possibility of such a case, which terminated at the request of Mr. Brock. He (Mr. Clowes) would endeavour to make out and explain how such a thing was possible. Suppose his (Mr. Clowes's) own father happened to be a scoundrel, and he blessed God for having so good a father as his was; suppose that he had traded in human flesh, but that before he did that he had turned pious and philanthropic, he had left him (Mr. Clowes) all that he possessed; and suppose he left him slaves, what was he to do? Were he to let them loose in the country, he would run the risk of being tarred and feathered for setting them free; he would not like that, and should endeavour to escape it. Suppose he should say he would never hold his fellow-men as goods and chattels, come what might, yet was he to turn them adrift to be hunted and run down? He did not believe there could be many placed in such a position, but in the case supposed, he, (Mr. Clowes,) should not mind one jot or tittle, and he would even bear the reproach of being esteemed a slaveholder, if he might thereby hold a powerful hand over those slaves, for their own good, and for the good of their souls. He did not by this supposition mean to palliate slaveholding, but this was the case which he understood Mr. Clarke to drive at. He also quoted the testimony of J. J. Gurney, who, in his travels in the West Indies, had met with a pious lady, the owner of slaves, who was accustomed every day to offer up a prayer for a blessing to rest upon the labours of Sir Fowell Buxton, that she might get rid of those slaves. Now he (Mr. Clowes,) would have held out the right hand of Christian fellowship, and to that lady he would have said, "May God hear and answer your prayers, to deliver you from that most awful burden." He would not altogether throw stones at every body who had not come over here to clear themselves of what we, in this country had only so recently washed our hands, and, from which these hands are not yet quite dry. A man might be so situated as to be compelled to hold slaves, and he might not see his way clearly how to get rid of them without sacrificing their interests, and not his own; and such a man was not responsible for the atrocious and iniquitous laws which public opinion forced upon him, which said to him, "We will tie you to your slaves, we shall apply Lynch Law to you, if you attempt to liberate them." Talking about separating husband and wife, he (Mr. Clowes,) did not know what Mr. Brock's opinion was on the Poor-law, whether they were of one mind on the point of separating man and wife; but who would say that they were responsible for the separation of man and wife in this country, although the law was made by public opinion. There were many pious and good people who were opposed to that law, and there were other pious and good people who were in favour of it, deeming it necessary for the morality, good order, and regularity of the workhouse. (Mr. Clowes proceeded to draw the conclusion, that such a difference of opinion would not justify the denial of the Christian name to the parties upholding the law. He noticed the sugar question and its recent settlement, and drew a similar conclusion from the difference of opinion of those for and against that measure.)

Mr. G. Thompson, upon presenting himself to the meeting, was received with loud cheering, which, having subsided, he addressed the meeting as follows:—I beg it to be distinctly understood that I join issue with the rev. gentleman who has just addressed you. I challenge him to a public discussion of the proposition whether a man, under any conceivable circumstances, can claim and exercise a right to appropriate any human being? (Tremendous cheers.) I take the negative of that proposition; I say it is utterly impossible for a human being, without the most stupendous crime against his God, to stand for one instant in the position of the owner of another being. (Renewed cheers.) Of all slaveholders in the universe, that man is

the worst, by whatever virtues his character may be irradiated, who, having Gospel light, and professing to be a disciple of that Saviour, in whose covenant of grace all are included, and yet, nevertheless, gives the sanction of his virtues, his character, and Christianity to that unutterable crime of claiming property in man. (Cheers.) There is not, in the United States of America—from the banks of the Niagara to the banks of Sabine, from the sides washed by the Atlantic to those beneath the shade of the rocky mountain—a law, or a fragment of a law, against the emancipation of slaves. (Hear.) There is not a slave-owner in the United States who could not, in one instant, emancipate his slaves if he chose so to do. Now, Sir, before I come to this question—and which is a vital question; and from this hour forth the business of my life, at every proper opportunity, shall be to save my beloved country from the reproach of giving sanction of its holy religion to the crime of slave-holding in any part of the world; and I tell that rev. gentleman to-night that he has preached a religion eternally at war with the religion of Jesus Christ. (Loud cheers.) Before I come to that question, I want to say a word for the purpose of establishing my claim to be a witness upon this occasion. On this interesting occasion, allow me to play for a while the part of an egotist, and to say a few words respecting myself. By glancing at my own history in relation to the subject of slavery, my sole object is, to bespeak your confidence in the uprightness and consistency of the course which I shall this evening be compelled to take. If, in asking you to listen to a brief chapter in the life of the man who stands before you, I do wrong, I can only say, that I have never committed the offence before, and, in all probability, shall never repeat it. Nearly sixty years ago, my father, (now in his grave) impelled by a restless disposition, and a love of adventure, quitted a quiet home in the centre of England, and the jealous care of a pious parent, and went to Liverpool, anxious, like many other youths, both before and since, to see the world in foreign parts. The only situation he could obtain was that of captain's clerk, on board a slave-ship bound for Africa. He accompanied the vessel to the coast of Guinea, where she took in a cargo of human merchandise, and then sailed to one of the islands of the West Indies. He returned to the Coast of Africa, and again to the West Indies. By this time, his soul loathed utterly the horrid trade with which he had connected himself, and he bitterly repented the folly and the disobedience which had led him to forsake the parental roof. He saw not, however, at the time, any way of escape. The vessel was preparing for a third journey to Africa, when, providentially for my father, a line-of-battle ship, then cruising in that region, was in want of hands, and my father's ship was visited, for the purpose of impressing some of the men. While the King's officer was examining the common seamen, my father took him aside, and making him acquainted with this strong desire to quit the ship, earnestly entreated him to impress him. The officer complied, and in an hour afterwards, my father was on board a man-of-war. The King's ship was soon ordered home, and my father was paid off and discharged. In after life, he seldom referred to this part of his history. He was ashamed of it, and looked back upon it with deep sorrow and bitter remorse. Once, however, I heard him describe some of the scenes witnessed by him on board the slave-ship; and, though an infant at the time, the terrible scenes he depicted never ceased to dwell in my memory, or to be present to my imagination.

Mr. Thompson was here interrupted by an observation from Mr. Clowes; in reply to which, he said—I charge the reverend gentleman with saying there might be many slave-owners who were involuntary slave-holders, but to whom he himself would be glad to give the right hand of fellowship; and he told us that there were circumstances—even if you hooted him out of the Hall he would say so—in which he would keep his hold on his human property for their own good. (Hear.) Now I do not care how a man plunders the cradle—how he claims the right, if he does claim and exercise it, and vindicates it before the world—I tell him that he is, both in principle and practice, the basest of all robbers in the world. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I am speaking of principles, and not of amiable, enlightened, and worthy men; and I say again, they are cradle plunderers and women whippers. [Mr. Clowes here with some warmth interrupted Mr. Thompson.] Neither the rev. gentleman or any one else, shall misunderstand me. I am about now honestly to discuss the proposition, that slaveholding, under all circumstances, known or conceivable, is a sin. That is the proposition which I place before him, and I will, it he pleases, come to Norwich and discuss it with him. I say that no man, under any conceivable circumstances, can, without an usurpation of the prerogatives of God himself, and without the deepest sin, stand for an instant in the relation of the owner of a fellow man. That there are no circumstances in the world that would justify him for a moment in standing in that relation. That if the universe were to give way at his feet, it is his bounden duty to reverence the law of God as above all other laws; to say, "a human being belongs to himself and to his God, and let God take care of the consequence. Duty is mine; results are his. I will pursue the straight line of duty, and clear my own skirts of this heinous sin of slaveholding; and if I be hanged to-morrow my martyrdom will do more to liberate the captives of the world, than all the kindness of all the slaveholders who ever lived upon the world's surface." (Loud cheers.) Oh! it is a horrid doctrine, that of doing evil that good may come! It is the doctrine of devils; and never is it more undiluted diabolism than when it is applied to slavery. "I will keep my power over these human beings for the sake of their souls." Is that the way souls are to be saved? No. Are they listening to that voice which spoke on Sinai, or to that voice which was heard in Jerusalem 1,800 years ago. No, sir, our motto is—"Fiat justitia; ruat cœlum." Do thou thy duty, and he who sits on high will take care of the consequences. Now, sir, I was just about relating a little of my own experience, and I think I said, when I was called off, that it was my wont, whenever I would sympathise with a human being, to try to get into his circumstances. I did that in my childhood with regard to the slave. My father described the pestiferous hold in which the stolen Africans were stowed, the manacles and fetters with which they were confined, the frightful madness which on one occasion prevailed, when the ship's water run short, the fearful mortality, and the troops of hungry sharks that followed the wake of the ship, waiting for their daily supply of human carcases. He spoke, too, of the diabolical cruelty of the fiendish captain, who, on one occasion, snatched a crying infant from the arms of its slave-mother, and hurled it into the billows of the deep; and, on another, seized a sick negro by the ears, and dashed his brains out against the side of the ship. After this, I often wept in secret over the wrongs of

"These poor disinherited outcasts of man,
Whom avarice coins into slaves."

At one time my thoughts would be in Africa, amidst burning villages, and flying fugitives, and troops of weary victims, traversing hundreds of miles on their way to the coast, to be carried into returnless bondage; at another, they were upon the gloomy ocean, amidst the horrors of the middle passage; and at another, upon the plantation, where the sable exile toiled without hope, beneath the lash of the coarse and iron-hearted driver. It has ever been my practice, when I would sympathise with a fellow-creature, to put myself in his circumstances, and try to realise his condition—to get, as it were, into his very soul, and to feel pang for pang, and joy for joy, and hope for hope with him. I did so in regard to the slave, and a fancy, far more vivid then than now, enabled me, to some extent, to feel for those in bonds as bound with them. Of course, I dreamed not then of any plan of effort for the relief of these unhappy beings, or of even doing more than pity them; but it was a melancholy pleasure to me to fancy their condition, and I felt my being enlarged, and, so to speak, multiplied, by these attempts to be for the time in the place of others. Oh! how often have I in solitude fancied myself a black man—an African slave—wandering by moonlight on the beach, thinking of his native country, his wife and his children, his "rude hut," and "his young barbarians all at play," whom he might never, never see again—himself a captive to the Christian! How often have I repeated aloud the beautiful verses of Cowper:—

"Is there, as ye sometimes tell us,
Is there One who reigns on high?
Has he bid you buy and sell us,
Speaking from his throne—the sky?
Ask him, if your knotted scourges,
Matches, blood-extorting screws,
Are the means which duty urges
Agents of his will to use?

Hark! he answers—Wild tornadoes,
Strewing yonder sea with wrecks;
Wasting towns, plantations, meadows,
Are the voice with which he speaks.
He, foreseeing what vexations
Afric's sons should undergo,
Fixed their tyrants' habitations
Where his whirlwinds answer—No."

I thank God for this early experience! This hatred of slavery "grew with my growth, and strengthened with my strength." At eighteen, I became acquainted with the state of things in the West Indies, through having the opportunity of reading the private correspondence of Wesleyan Missionaries in Jamaica and elsewhere; and I was also familiar with the writings of John Wesley, who, in the last letter he ever wrote, on the 26th of February, 1791, addressing Mr. Wilberforce, said: "Unless the Divine power has raised you up to be as *Athanasius contra mundum* (Athanasius against the world,) I see not how you can go through your glorious enterprise in opposing that execrable villany, which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature. Unless God has raised you up for this very thing, you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils. But 'if God be for you, who can be against you?' Go on, in the name of God, and in the power of his might, till even American slavery (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish before it." My impressions were subsequently deepened by hearing a sermon preached in 1824 before the Wesleyan Missionary Society, by that great and good man, the late Richard Watson, a sermon from the text, "Honour all men," a sermon unsurpassed for the eloquence of its style, the force of its reasoning, the loftiness of its sentiments, and the fervour of its appeal, founded on revealed truth, to the friends of justice and humanity. In 1828, while connected with a mutual improvement society, meeting at Salvador-house, Bishopsgate street, I took part in a discussion of the subject of slavery, which lasted for eleven evenings. In 1829, I again debated the subject before a large audience in the theatre of the London Literary and Scientific Institution, and, in 1830, read, with indescribable emotion, the splendid argument of the ever to be lamented Dr. Andrew Thomson, of Edinburgh. The reading of that unrivalled speech led me to see the essential sinfulness of slaveholding under all circumstances, and the duty of immediate and unconditional emancipation. Let me observe that, down to this period, I was an utterly obscure and unknown individual, nor had I, until the spring of 1831, the remotest idea that I should ever be honoured to stand forth as the public advocate of the abolition of slavery, still less be honoured with the friendship of the friends of freedom, both in the eastern and western hemisphere. But, if, during the last sixteen years I have done anything to advance the cause of human freedom, let me ascribe it, under providence, to the direction given to my thoughts and feelings in early life—to the admonitions of a father of refined, and enlightened, and liberal sentiments, and still more to the lessons of a beloved mother, whose heart was, and is, big enough to embrace the whole human family in its regards, and who had always a tear for every suffering member of that family. And oh! let me exhort all who are here, to consider the dread responsibility of the guardians to youth, to impart, in early life, sound views and high principles, so may you, peradventure, be training, all unconsciously, some mind that shall, hereafter, in the strength and vigour of its manhood, become the quickener and regenerator of the thoughts and minds of millions. Early in 1831, I offered my services to the London Anti-Slavery Society—they were accepted, and I went forth, with fear and trembling, to be the agent of that Society, and the exponent of its doctrines and plans. My instructions were to declare, in every place, that slaveholding, of whatever form, and under whatever circumstances, is a crime against God, and ought to be immediately abandoned; that instant emancipation is the duty of the master, and the right of the slaves. Our motto was, *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum;* though we had no fear of the *ruat cœlum.* With a noble and a mighty object before me, I set myself to the work of acquiring all the information within my reach. I studied the history of the abolition of the Slave-trade. I became familiar with the events of that interesting period in the history of this question:

"When Sharpe, on proud Britannia's chartered shore,
From Lybian limbs the unsanctioned fetter tore;
And taught the world that while she ruled the waves,
Her soil is freedom to the feet of slaves."

In imagination I lived with Clarkson, that great and good man, now gone to his rest, through his career of mercy; from the time that, resting by the way-side, he gave himself to the abolition of the accursed Slave-trade, until he saw his efforts crowned with success by the Act of 1807. I read the history of the Slave-trade by the venerable man who has recently gone to his rest. I was with him a few days ago, when he placed in my hands this manuscript as a record of his last and most

mature thoughts on the subject of slavery. Here it is, blotted and blurred by the blind old man. (Cheers.) "Many weary days and weeks," said he, "have I been writing this manuscript. I place it in your hands, and in the hands of your beloved friend;" for he was then with me. When I speak of that man I speak of one—I will name him in a moment—to whom my soul is knit as the soul of Jonathan to David. If there be purity and sincerity of spirit on earth—if there be one that grasps humanity, and lives only to exalt that humanity and do the will of God—he is that man; yet traduced and villified by those who enter not into his spirit nor comprehend the sublimity of his destination—and that man is William Lloyd Garrison. (Loud cheers.) The old man, Thomas Clarkson, was then verging on his grave. He placed this document in our hands, saying, "Here are my last thoughts on slavery; I confide them to you." He did so with sundry compliments to myself, which I am not boastful enough to repeat. "Those are my thoughts; make them public when you please. That is my testimony upon American slavery." And what does the venerable Thomas Clarkson say upon American slavery? Why, that slavery, as it exists among the churches in America is downright infidelity, dehumanising man, and dethroning Deity himself. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) The battle in which, as a humble agent, I was called to engage was severe, but it was short. The year 1833 saw the principle of emancipation recognised by the Legislature, and an Act passed for the extinction of slavery. In that year I became acquainted with one whose friendship I value above price. The Clarkson of America in that year paid a visit to this country, to expose the hollow, and inhuman, and deceitful schemes of the American Colonization Society, and to make known the principles and purposes of the friends of immediate abolition in New England. That man was William Lloyd Garrison. I was Mr Garrison's fellow labourer while he remained here. We attended public meetings together; we visited the venerable Wilberforce a few weeks previous to his death; we stood together at the grave of that illustrious man, and saw peers, and prelates, and princes of the blood-royal, gathered to do honour to the lifeless dust of the once despised, oft baffled, but at last, under God, the victorious friend of the negro; and we thought of the words of the poet—

"So sleep the good, who sink to rest
With all their country's wishes blest;
When spring with dewy fingers cold,
Returns to deck their hallow'd mould,
She there shall dress a sweeter sod,
Than fancy's feet have ever trod.
By fairy hands their knell is rung,
By forms unseen their dirge is sung;
There Honour comes—a pilgrim gray,
To bless the turf that wraps their clay;
And Freedom shall awhile repair,
To dwell a weeping hermit there."

I was invited by the New England Anti-Slavery Society to visit the United states, and to labour there as I had done here. I sat down to count the cost. The abolitionists of America were a small, despised, and persecuted body. Mr. Garrison was accounted a madman and an incendiary, upon whose head a price of 5,000 dollars had been set by the Legislature of Georgia. I foresaw opprobrium, danger, and even death staring me in the face. I asked myself, "Is the object worthy the sacrifice?" and the answer came, "It is the freedom of two millions and a-half of helpless and down-trodden human beings." I asked. "Are the principles on which the battle is to be fought were sound?" The answer came, "Yes—let the oppressed go free, is the command of Jehovah. God hath created all men free and equal, and hath endowed them with inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Slaveholding is a crime and ought to be abandoned." I asked, "What can I do?" The answer came, "Cry aloud, spare not. Bear testimony for God and humanity against oppression and robbery. Preach the law to the sinner, and the Gospel to the victim; and lo! the God who hath made of one blood all the nations of men, will be with you." I asked myself, "Can I stand in the evil day, and having done all stand;" and the answer came, "My grace is sufficient for thee. My strength shall be made perfect in your weakness. Greater is he that is for you, than all that can come against you." I asked again, "Will not this be an unwarrantable interference with the institutions of a foreign country?" and the answer came, "The cause of humanity is of no country. Thou hast a right to lift up thy voice against the enslavement of thy brother in all countries. It is for thy God thou pleadest, and he is king of nations. It is his law thou proclaimest, and his law is above all other laws, and is universal in its obligations It is for man thou liftest up thy voice, whose rights are the same in every latitude and every climate." I said, "I will go,' and I wept. Those who were the witnesses of my acts, will not refuse their testimony that I did not cower before the terrific storm which assailed me, and, for many months, threatened my life. In 1836 I returned to England, and continued to lecture against American slavery, until the struggle came for the abolition of the apprenticeship system, during which I stood for the first time on the spot which I have now the honour to occupy. That conflict over, I turned my attention to the east, and have ever since been occupied (except at intervals) in efforts to bring my countrymen to recognise the claims which an empire like India, and a hundred millions of fellow subjects have upon their sympathy, and their benevolent exertions. In doing this, I have still had in view the overthrow of slavery, and I now hold in my hand a volume of published lectures, in which I think I have demonstrated that the only simple and certain method of uprooting the system of slavery, (as far as it rests for its support upon the profits of slave-labour,) is to encourage the free-labour of the east, and to bring into the markets of this country, and to send into the markets of other countries, the sugar, rice, cotton, and tobacco now grown in the slaveholding and slave-trading countries of America. Thus, by one and the same act, immeasurably increasing our commerce, elevating and improving the condition of the natives of India, and driving out of consumption the products of uncompensated labour. During the long apprenticeship which I have served on this question,—throughout which, let it be borne in mind, I have not merely been a professed abolitionist in principle, but a man constantly at work upon the subject, and in contact every hour, more or less, with the question in one or other of its phases,—I have been compelled to study every branch of the great subject. I have had to argue the question upon every ground that has ever been taken. I have held public and private controversies with the apologists of slavery of every name and character. I have had to sift and try every scheme professing to be an abolition scheme, which has sought public notice and public support. I have been connected with the American movement since before the formation of the Anti-Slavery Society. I think I know the standing on this question of almost every public man in the United

States. I have paid special attention to the progress of the anti-slavery movement in the churches of America; having been called upon to lay the state of the question, in this respect, before several of the ecclesiastical bodies of Scotland, besides having had a protracted debate upon it, with one of the most able ministers in the United States, — the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore. I am thoroughly conversant with the grounds of all divisions which have taken place among the abolitionists of the United States, and know precisely the nature of the different plans by which the several parties are seeking to promote the Anti-slavery cause. I know the origin and authors of the various misrepresentations which have been promulgated on both sides of the Atlantic, against the truest and best friends of the slave; and I think I know the motives in which these misrepresentations and false charges have originated. For twelve years I have watched the conduct of every deputation that has gone from a religious body in this country to the churches of America—from the delegation of Drs. Reed and Matheson down to the deputation from the Free Church of Scotland, and that from the Society of Friends. I know the conduct which has been pursued, on the Anti-slavery question, by all the conspicuous members of the late delegation from America to the Evangelical Alliance. I know precisely where Drs. Patton, Emery, Smyth, Olin, Beecher, Peck, and Cox stand upon this question. I know, most intimately, what the course has been, which the churches to which they belong have taken. I know in what position they would place themselves if they took thorough Anti-slavery ground here. I know the nature and worth of the arguments they have employed, and the assertions they have made. I know with what view they have used these arguments and assertions. I know the nature and the cause of the strong sympathy which subsists between the delegates from America, and the leading clerical members of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. I know the whole proceedings of the Alliance, and the difficulties, trials, temptations, shortcomings, concessions, and compromises of that body. I had means of knowing how they proceeded from day to day. I heard both sides of the question. I not only saw their proceedings, as published, but I heard what was the nature of their discussions in their Committees, upon the various points which came before them. I have read all the leading articles, and all the letters which have been written on the subject, both *pro* and *con*—both in vindication and in censure of the doings of the Alliance, and I have deliberately weighed everything having the shape of an argument. Thus much I have said to justify you in granting me a hearing on this subject. Further, let me say, I have nothing to do with the Evangelical Alliance, apart from the question of slavery. I shall give no opinion respecting its object, its principles, its doctrinal basis, or its proceedings, apart from slavery, and I utterly disclaim being influenced by any desire to bring the Evangelical Alliance, as such, into disrepute, or to injure the reputation of any of its members. I am here, for the simple purpose of helping you to determine, whether, upon the question of slavery, the Alliance, judged by its own standard, did or did not do its duty; and whether its conduct did or did not injure, or threaten to injure, the cause of emancipation for three millions of our fellow men, and the cause of freedom throughout the world. The question of slavery was brought into the Alliance, was discussed in the Alliance, was acted upon in the Alliance. The question of slavery, therefore, has been touched by that body, has been affected by that body. The sacred principle of human liberty has been handled by that body; above all, the question of slavery in connexion with the Gospel of Christ, and the duties of Christians, in this the nineteenth century, has been taken up and disposed of by that body. The question is, What has been done? Has a signal blow been struck at the monster-sin of the present generation, or not? Have the *enemies* or the *friends* of freedom cause to rejoice over the proceedings of that body? Can we take the law on the question of slavery from that body, or can we not? Can we quote its proceedings in our favour, or can we not? The doings of the Alliance will, as a matter of course, be defended by the members of that body. The proceedings of that body will be quoted throughout the Christian world. If there are any grounds of difference between that body and the professed friends of the slave in this country, it is necessary that they should be deferred; that we should join issue; that we should take the field on either side, and that the people at large should have the opportunity of deciding whether *our* standard or *theirs* is the right one, and whether *we* or *they* have rightly judged upon the points on which we are opposed. This is the subject we have to discuss on this occasion. Need I say, we should do it honestly, temperately, and impartially? I never heard an out and out southern slaveholder touch the Bible to defend slavery; he leaves that to the clergy. He does not go to the Bible; he knows he shall bring perdition swift to his soul by binding his victim to the horns of the altar. I know the American members of the Alliance. In every one of their churches there is a negro pew—a "Jim Crow pew"—(laughter)—where God's children who are present and come to the communion-table are set apart from the rest of the congregation. Then the minister, having served the white members of the church, will turn and say, "Christian coloured people, come and take the Lord's Supper for your comfort. God is no respecter of persons!" (Hisses, groans, and great sensation.) I tell that gentleman, that he left the negro-pew at home. While that pew stands, with any one of these men in the pulpit, with it before his eyes—while he tolerates it, I denounce him everywhere as—(the conclusion of the sentence was lost in a burst of applause.) I know these men; I have had occasion, through many years, to sift the chaff from the wheat; I know who are abolitionists, and who are not. Look at Dr. Cox; read his speeches at Liverpool and Manchester, and those also briefly reported in London. Oh! he is exuberant and over flowing and everflowing in his hatred of slaves. Well, Sir, two short months before he trod the shores of England, where was he? Sitting as Moderator of the New School of the General Assembly of the United States, listening to thirty-one speeches in defence of slaves from Doctors of Divinity, rev. clergymen, and elders in that church; and I cannot find in the columns of the *New York Evangelist*, which repeated the doings of that body, one word that he ever uttered in denunciation either of the doctrine or the crime. (Hear, hear.) On the contrary, he said, "Send me to the Evangelical Alliance,"—he said to his slave-holding brethren—I repeat his words,—"send me to the Evangelical Alliance, and your honour is safe in my keeping; if there be aught said or done to call your Christianity in question, I will walk out, and shake the dust from my feet." I speak in the presence of ready writers; I have spoken of this elsewhere; I have spoken of it on one side of the Strand, while Dr. Cox was eloquently descanting upon Christian Union on the other. Oh, I love union; God send the day when union will not only be the rallying cry, but the motto of the human family; but, until you can have this union in righteousness and freedom; until

you can have a union that will allow me to see my brother black man liberated from thraldom, never let that union come. (Hear.) If it is to be a union of white men to the discarding of the claims of the black, perish every such union. (Cheers.) Then, take Dr. Beecher; he emptied his college in Cincinnati, because his students discussed the question of slavery, and drove out (happily for our cause he did so) some of the brightest men in America, because they thought they might be permitted to discuss anti-slavery questions. They might talk about temperance, moral reform, missions to the Hindoos or Caribs to the Patagonians or the natives of New Zealand; but they took into their heads one night to talk about the negro, and that was a great offence. They might talk about the Poles, and send them banners to fight under in their efforts to save their country from the grasp of the Russian Autocrat; but they one day found out that they had Poles at their own door—(a laugh)—and they ventured to pity them. For this Dr. Beecher drove them out. Theodore Weld and Henry B. Stanton had no more education in the college; but, with the education of the heart and mind, with the simplicity, with the spirit and love of Christ, they went forth as abolition lecturers over the length and breadth of the free states. Take Dr. Patten: that rev. gent. leaves his church in New York and finds a substitute in the Rev. Mr. Page. The Rev. Mr. Page is not many Sabbaths there before he gets a slave-holding brother to preach for him twice on the Sabbath-day. A paper in New York ventured to find fault with brother Page for getting the rev. man-stealer to preach the Gospel in Dr. Patten's church; the same paper also ventured to hint, that the Jim-Crow pew is not a very consistent thing in the church of Christ—in the church of him, who, if he displayed any partiality at all, displayed it towards the poor and despised; who, amidst the hosannahs of thousands, called down the hated publican from the tree, and said, "Zaccheus, to-day I will abide at thy house;" but who, if he ever was known to speak in terms of denunciation and invective, uttered not those denunciations against the wretched, miserable, and ignorant, but against those whited walls—those painted sepulchres—those Pharisees and scribes, who, while they tithed mint, anise, and cummin, and had their Evangelical Alliance, forgot the weightier matters of the law—judgment, justice, and mercy. (Cheers.) Well, this paper ventured to hint that the nigger pew was not a very comely sight in a church where the praises of him, who came "to seek and save that which was lost" were sung, and who will say to those whom he will separate from the wicked and place on his right hand, "Come ye blessed of my father," and will give them heaven itself, because that in doing it unto the least of his brethren, they did it unto him. (Cheers.) Well, the Rev. Mr. Page came out with a reply; he admitted that a slaveholder had preached; it was rather an oversight, but he would be more cautious in future. They did not exclude the slave-holder, but inquired whether they were slave-holders for their own interest or not. (Cheers and laughter.) Holding a slave for his good! If anybody wants to know how to punish me, let him get up in St. Andrew's-hall, or anywhere else, and talk about holding slaves for their good, and I assure him that he would inflict punishment on my spirit quite as bad as if he had inflicted thirty lashes on my back. (Cheers.) Holding slaves for their good! Violating God's law for their good? Would you like to be slaves for your own good—that man there with the hairy cap on—would you (addressing the individual) like to be a slave to the Rev. Mr. Clowes for your own good. (Hear.) He would look after your soul, and not send you adrift. What would you say to Mr. Clowes if he had made such a proposition to you? He would not like to attempt it. Holding slaves for their own good! What is a slave? A thing; the man is gone. What is a slave? A piece of property. What is a slave? A man whose every function and prerogative is annihilated. He who would enslave a man, what is there in the universe that he would not enslave? (Cheers.) I have no right to have a slave till I can make a man. (Cheers.) When I can make a man I can call him mine; but if God made him he is not mine. Hands off! he belongs to God. (Cheers.) You utter a blasphemy by saying you will take him and hold him for his good. What, dethrone God for the good of the slave! If you make an idol and worship it you dethrone God; if you seize a man and make him a slave, you have robbed God. Look on his face, black though it be; it bears the stamp and impress of Jehovah. Does then the reverend defender of slavery "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's?" When thou seest Cæsar's impress on the coin of the realm, look in thy brother's eye, and in his heart read the image of thy God: render unto thy Maker the things that are his. (Immense applause.) I say to that reverend gentleman—Hands off! Holding me as a slave! I must dwell on this. How long shall you live, I would ask? Have you a specific antidote for apoplexy? Have you an omniscience to foresee and guard against the casualties of life? Do you never travel by the Eastern Counties Railway? (Loud laughter.) Are you proof against any of the ills that life is heir to? Do you wear a charmed life? Could you not show us you are immortal? Because if I am to become yours, and my wife and my children are to become yours, and my progeny for ever are to be your slaves, though you are a very good man, I should like to see your proof of immortality and of perpetual prosperity. You make me a slave for my good, do you? you die, and then where am I? Were I free, I might baffle with the waves of fortune. Quitting South Carolina, I might walk into Pennsylvania; or taking a fancy to go a litle further, reach Buffalo, or the centre of the Niagara river, and guided by the north star, might even reach the dominions of Victoria, and looking back upon Egypt, say, "I quit thee for ever and for aye!" Make a man a slave for his good! "I will do it though you should hoot me out of this hall." Do not hoot such a man out of the hall; Christians of Norwich pray for him; pray that the eyes of his mind may be enlightened, that the spirit of truth may come on him, that he may learn what those passages mean, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Owe no man anything, least of all owe him his liberty. Take not that which is not thine own; most of all forbear to take that which is thy God's. (Cheers.) Oh! execrable sin, for man to aspire above his Creator. (Cheers.) Well, I must come back to Mr. Page; I never forget anything, however long my digression may be; I come back to the extract page where I left off. (Laughter.) Mr. Page read a letter, admitting that a man-stealer had occupied Dr. Patten's pulpit; I call them man-stealers. I cannot call them robbers; because if I did so I should have to beg pardon of the highwaymen for classing them with such monsters. There is not one other expression which defines their crimes. We cannot put sheep-stealers and coat-stealers by the side of these men. Perish these garments, perish all that is called good in the world, but leave me liberty—liberty and a crust—friendless liberty, disfranchised liberty if you

politically so—but gi . me personal liberty; let me call my wife my own, my child my own; and when I close my hovel-door, hovel though it be, let me have it sacred from the aggressions of reverend man-stealers, who would make me a slave. (Cheers.) Well, now listen, if ever your blood crawled in your veins, let it be to-night. Mr. Page, I say, admits he had a man-stealer to preach for him. Listen, reverend friends, listen; hear what he says, and I will ask you to endeavour to determine in your own mind if you ever heard blasphemy more unmitigated than that I am going to read. The Rev. Mr. Page, the substitute of Dr. Patten, was recently in the Evangelical Alliance—see what is said by him about the negro pew in Dr. Patten's church. "As to what is said about the 'Jim Crow pew' in Dr. Patten's church, I will remark, that there are quite a number of them there, and very commodious ones too, situated, not in the lowest room, but near the head of the table, close by the master of the ceremonies. Indeed they are placed conspicuous, right over the heads of the white worshippers underneath them, higher up a little towards heaven than even the pulpit itself, at Dr. Patten's right hand, and near his heart, I have no doubt. They are seated just as the Son of God himself is seated—(sensation)—on high, above the great congregation, in the eye of all, and by the right hand of their best friend." (Expressions of disgust.) That is by the colleague of Dr. Patten, written by the hand of that man in New York. Did you mark the phraseology of that? They are the people up there; they go up by a separate stair-case. I never was in a pulpit with that negro pew till it was filled with white as well as coloured people. (Cheers.) Why, Mr. Sheriff, if you have not heard it before, hear it now. No language can express the malignity of this said prejudice against colour. It follows a man everywhere Here I have a noble-minded friend—(pointing to Mr. Daly)—a man with a fine mind an an eloquent pen, and a heart as big as the world and bigger too. (Cheers.) He, if he were to present himself at the door of a theatre in Boston, the modern Athens, mind you, of America, would be turned back: he is a negro. If he went to the Zoological Gardens, he would be turned back with this intimation, that no niggers were admitted there. If he attended a revival meeting, and dared to enter at the centre aisle, and walked up with those who were seeking for the salvation of their souls, he would be told that was not a place for niggers, but he must go higher up. (Sensation.) I saw enough of this. Like slavery itself, this system is vindicated from the Bible. I will just give you one specimen of the way in which it is done. I was riding in a stage-coach with a lady who was tainted with the prejudice against people of colour. I said to her, "If you cannot agree to mix together on earth, you will at last do so in heaven." "Oh," said she, "I do not know. 'In my Father's house are many mansions.'" (Expressions of disgust.) Well, Sir, so much for Mr. Page; having done with the parson let us come to the Clarke. (A laugh.) He arrived, as you are aware, just two days before the Alliance Convention closed. He gave in his credentials in the morning, and in the afternoon of the same day he was with me; he took tea with me, and sat with me during the evening. There were two other gentlemen present, one of them an American clergyman. I talked over the whole doings of the Evangelical Alliance with him from the beginning to the end, and criticised their proceedings. He heard me express my opinions, but throughout the whole interview refrained from expressing any dissent from that opinion. Place that over against his assertion here, that he promised his beloved father, Dr. Cox, that wherever he goes he will vindicate the course of the Alliance on the question of slavery. He went with us at night to an Anti-slavery meeting, where my friend, Mr. Garrison, spoke. I will tell you what I said to him; I will be frank. I said, you come from a Methodist church in America, a country where Methodists are numerous, respectable, and influential. I know that neither myself nor Mr. Garrison are in good odour with them, in consequence of our severe reprehension of the proceedings of the Alliance. (Mr. Thompson here stated the caution he gave Mr. Clarke against identifying himself with the advocates of unqualified abolition, and his recommendation to him to advocate the interests of the slave amongst his religious brethren in every mode he judiciously could; to which Mr. Clarke gave his assent; and yet, notwithstanding what passed at this interview, Mr. Clarke had expressed his decided disapprobation at the course pursued by Mr. Garrison, and his determination to stick by the Alliance as long as it existed. With regard to Mr. Clarke's statement respecting involuntary slaveholding, Mr. Thompson proceeded. I say there is not one involuntary slaveholder in America. Take this case—My father leaves me slaves; has he made me a slaveholder thereby? Certainly not. Nothing can make me a slaveholder but holding slaves myself. Your father left you a bag of money; you need not touch it if you consider it the fruit of wrong. Where did your father get the slaves? How could he leave them to you, reverend sir; they never were his? Where are his title-deeds from the Almighty, that he might transmit them with other parchments and records? Time does not help you to sanctify crime. Say you that your slave descended from the first cargo that were landed on the banks of St. James river; they have been stolen goods from that hour to the present. How dare you, reverend sir, take them? Your father left them to you did he? You have a Father in heaven, sir, did that father leave them to you, that is the question. (Loud cheers.) There is a limit to filial obedience—there is a limit to the acquisition of property. I suppose our friend will admit that, when he looks behind him at the Ten Commandments, "Thou shalt not steal," is one of them. I tell him that if he dared to take one of the slaves his father left him, he is a robber of the first magnitude. (Hear, hear.) Suppose his father had left him, me. (Laughter.) Why, not I? One father left Frederick Douglas to his son; am I better than he? Am I better than the poorest wretch, who with sun blistered back, is at this hour on the rice plantation of an Episcopal Methodist bishop? No; he has organs, senses, faculties, passions, like myself, a soul of infinite capacity like mine, taking a wider sphere, seeking eternity to bring forth its powers and find employment for its unbounded scope. (Cheers.) Supposing I had been that slave: will the reverend gentleman come here and tell me to my face that he would have made me labour? How would he have enforced his right, if I had said I would not be a slave? I am free, free in soul; free thoughts are never to be sold. Free to choose, I will take my choice. Do you say slavery or fetters? I say fetters. Do you say slavery and good food? or freedom, rags, wretchedness, and starvation? Give me rags, give me starvation, give me wretchedness; with my rags fluttering in the breeze, and God's free heaven above me, and his free wind around me, and these free arms to labour, I will go forth, nor thank you, rev. sir, for your paternal care. (Loud cheers.) You will treat me kindly, will you? Keep your kindness for your pigs, I am a man. (Renewed cheers. I have rights, sir. I am not going

to buy a mess of pottage by the sacrifice of my humanity. You will keep me, sir; are you better than I am? If so, show it me. Turn to your Bible and show me why you are better than me. Why, God teaches me in his word that he is no respecter of persons; that he hath made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth; that Ethiopia as well as England, shall stretch out her hands to God, and that he has his own likeness stamped on every soul. (Hear.) Prove that I am not a man, or cease to claim me as your own. Suppose that I were to be that gentleman's slave—will he show me his scriptural authority for forcing me to remain in that state? Where is his authority? How could he enforce my labour? Think of the reverend gentleman with a whip in his hand, saying, I will make you. (Laughter.) Mark, if he has a right to claim me, he has an equal right to enforce obedience. I will fix his claim to me upon that principle. If he can show a right to hold a slave, then he can readily show a right to enforce his obedience: he has got that warrant? I have always considered that that was the effect of a Christian man being a slave-holder. These poor wretches, the slaves, cannot talk as I can; but if they cannot, O, what eloquence is there not in the scars and wounds of their chafed and mangled limbs; aye, what eloquence in that very stupidity to which they are doomed; for, if there is more eloquence in slavery of one form than another, it is in the form of him who is made but a little lower than the angels, reduced by slavery until his woes are speechless, and he can but put himself all dumb and embruted before men. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Thompson then, after a strain of touching eloquence and powerful argument, proceeded to observe on Mr. Clarke's statement, that there were 100,000 Christian slaveholders. He (Mr. Thompson) denied that the terms Christian and slaveholder could be put together. Mr. Clarke had called them mere slaveholders, but let them see how that term would read as applied to other matters: mere sheep stealers, mere adulterers, mere drunkards, or mere anything else they pleased. He (Mr. Thompson) would not refuse to give the right hand of fellowship to a Christian brother from America who was a mere drunkard, a mere adulterer, a mere pirate, or a mere extortioner; for, if they were to be liberal, let them carry out their liberality. Why, in men stealing all the crimes above enumerated were comprised. It was a crime against the soul and the body, against man and against God; it was a perpetual crime. Drunkenness was the crime of an hour; slavery the crime of a life. Every moment (said Mr. Thompson) the slaveholder was a robber; praying and robbing; preaching and robbing; coming to the Evangelical Alliance and robbing; expounding the Scriptures and robbing while he expounds them; for while he is preaching here the slave is toiling there, and the cry of his labourers by him kept back of fraud, is passing through the ranks of cherubim and seraphim of the angel and the archangel, and entering the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. (Cheers.) I tell Mr. Clarke from this platform, brother, you have done the cause of your suffering fellow-creatures wrong. He says he treats slavery in the abstract, but mark, it is in the concrete in Louisiana, in the sugar plantations. Mr. Thompson proceeded in a most convincing style of argument to combat the principle of voluntary slavery. He contended that there were hundreds of young men educated at colleges in the Northern States of America, who went south for the purpose of marrying women possessed of slaves, men, too, who are seen at Evangelical Alliance and Bible Society platforms in this country. He read an extract, showing that the Southern conference had elected two bishops, who were extensive owners of slaves. Can you conceive (said Mr. T.) of Christ and seventy five slaves. Would he have been a slave-holder? No; if these gentlemen want to imitate Christ let them give up slave-holding; let them denude themselves of wealth obtained by robbery, and learn of him, who while the foxes had holes and the birds of the air nests, had not where to lay his head. They keep them for their good, do they? but they always keep them in the negro houses and not in their own. They keep them for their good; yes, they have sofas and cushions, while the slaves have wretched mats on damp floors. They keep them for their good; yes, and preach to them such sermons as I will refer to. Mr. Thompson, after quoting from the paper announcing the election of the two bishops, proceeded to observe, that the charges he had brought were applicable to all denominations in America. Excuses had that day been made in St. Andrew's-hall, which were not made in the Southern States themselves, where even among the ecclesiastical bodies the right to retain slaves was founded on the plea of their being *bona fide* property. Did the reverend gentleman know the extent to which the doctrine he had preached would carry him? (Hear, hear.) He first says, that slavery was an accursed thing, and he then goes on to state that God places men in these circumstances which necessitates them to commit that accursed sin: such was the corollary from his arguments, that God forces many persons to whom he (Mr. Clowes) would be glad to give the right hand of fellowship to commit this sin. (Hear.) What said the angels to Lot when sentence was pronounced against the cities of the plain? He told them to make haste, and tarry not, lest they should be consumed. He (Mr. T.) had sometimes imagined, that he saw the planters of the South coming with penitence and walking out with their elders, bishops, deacons, class leaders, private members, stewards, trustees, and slaves from the Southern States. Oh, there was a way out of the States, as well as into them; the slave found it without a chart. It had been said that the slaveholders were prevented from emancipating their slaves by the prohibition of the law; but he denied the existence of any such law in the United States, although there were certain conditions imposed on the owner, such as security against their becoming chargeable to the State, or their being removed from the state within twelve months. There was not a man living in America, who could not give up slaveholding if he pleased. Mr. Thompson passed to the subject of negro runaways, and eloquently eulogised the Society of Friends, whose members ever showed sympathy with the hunted and persecuted slaves; in confirmation of which, he related an anecdote of the escape of a number of negroes, who were saved from their pursuers by the presence of mind and the ingenious device of a Quaker. Mr. Thompson proceeded. But even if there were difficulties as was alleged, in the way of slave emancipation were they not (the masters), if Christians, called upon to bear their testimony for Christ, as the early Christians did? If (said Mr. Thompson) you would save the slaveholder for the love of his soul, do not apologise him to hell. Do not sooth him with cries of peace when there is no peace. We do not unchristianise men by refusing them admittance into the Evangelical Alliance. I do, in my own mind, because I cannot see the congruity with slaveholding. The Alliance did not admit the Plymouth brethren, nor the Quakers, within their doctrinal basis, but by so doing, they did

not unchristianise those bodies. The resolution, which was adopted by the Alliance, instead of excluding slaveholders, expressed its confident hope that the several branch societies would not admit as members those who held slaves from their own fault; but as there was no law there could be no transgression in admitting all slaveholders into the Alliance. It was said that abolition should be effected by natural means, and not by violence. Such were the means they adopted. Some presbyteries and synods had made the abolition of slavery a test of membership. Gradual emancipation was nothing but the half-way between now and never. For twenty years a society existed in London, having for its professed object the gradual abolition of colonial slavery; and at the end of the period the evil was found to be neither mitigated nor gradually abolished, but the chapels were burnt in Jamaica. Would the rev. gentleman who advocated that principle, recommend a gradual abolition of drunkenness? Would they allow a gradual abandonment of polygamy—fifty wives to-day, but only forty-nine to-morrow. (Cheers.) Gradually running from the devil; knocking off a link a-day from an endless chain. If the institution were righteous, let it not be abolished; if unrighteous, why was it to be spared? It had been said that God did not disapprove of American slavery by the blessing which he poured upon the American churches in the Southern States; but nothing was more fallacious. "Christian slaveholders!" continued Mr. Thompson, "do let me dwell on it just for one moment. Our brother, for instance, has said he would take care of the souls of his slaves. He spoke of being made the instrument of converting them himself. What is a converted man? A child of God. What is a converted man? An heir of immortality and heaven. What is a converted man? A man whose body is the temple of the Holy Ghost. What is a converted man? A man whose name is written in the Lamb's book of life. What is a converted man? A man above principalities and powers, hereafter to be a king and priest to Christ and his God. What is a converted man? A being for whom the attributes of Jehovah are pledged; who says respecting him, "He who toucheth him toucheth the apple of mine eye." Christ's brother, a slave to the Rev. Mr. Clowes. (Sensation.) Christ in that man, the spirit of Christ, the image of Christ. But Christ is always on earth: "forasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me." "Lord, when?" "When ye did it unto one of them." But Christ is in America; he is not in the Doctor of Divinity peculiarly, nor in the President peculiarly; but I will tell you where he is; there, in the field. Hark, the groan! with woman shrieking beneath the lash, when she ought to be under the care of the medical man and the nurse: there is Christ. Well, where is Christ in our brother's plantation here? I say he is to be found with a whip at his back. When God calls down from heaven, and says, "Cain, Cain, where is Abel, thy brother?" the answer is, "He is on the plantation, growing sugar, while I am studying my sermon for to-morrow." That is Christian slaveholding. He is making merchandise of Christ himself. Why, Sir, in the plantation, when the slaves are sold as Christians, Christ is sold in them; they rise in value, as they rise in holiness and stature, as men and women in Christ Jesus. Now, who bids? 500 dollars offered for Jack, a good Christian. There is a reverend gentleman selling him. Who is he selling? Christ. Christian slaveholders! Thou art Christ's free man; yet, though thou art written in the Lamb's book on high, thy name is written in my ledger; and woe to any Brocks or Thompsons who dare get up and call in question my right to you as property. Christian slaveholders!—Christian Beelzebub. (The above passage was frequently interrupted by bursts of applause.) Mr. Thompson then proceeded to notice the kind of sermons preached to slaves, and quoted from a volume of discourses written for slaves by Bishop Meade, of Virginia, in which the learned bishop says, exhorting them to submission under correction, "that though they may be quite innocent of the crime laid to their charge, and suffer wrongfully, it is quite possible they may have done some other bad thing which was never discovered, and, therefore, the Almighty was punishing them for their former fault." Mr. Thompson then entered at some length into a detail of the proceedings of the Evangelical Conference, which he unequivocally condemned for its temporising on the question of slavery, and called upon his auditory to maintain the principle that slavery, under all circumstances, was a sin, and ought to be at once abandoned. (The eloquent speaker concluded his remarkably eloquent address amidst the loud and long-continued applause of the audience.)

Mr. Brock moved, and the Rev. A. Reed seconded, a vote of thanks to the Sheriff, which was agreed to.

Mr. Thompson solicited the indulgence of the audience to hear Mr. Daly, a gentleman of colour, who was a native of a slave State, who had accompanied him down to Norwich to be present at the meeting.

Mr. Daly came forward amidst loud applause. He stated, that he was born in Virginia, and that, could he disclose the secrets of that prison-house, it would, in the words of Shakespeare, "cause their hair to stand on end like quills upon the fretful porcupine."

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND SLAVERY.

(From the *Free Church Magazine.*)

The Rev. John Howard Hinton proposed the insertion of a clause to exclude all slaveholders from the Alliance. This opened the whole troubled subject of American slavery, and gave rise to a very protracted and perilous discussion, occupying the whole of the day. The subject was then referred to a Committee. Nearly the whole of Saturday was spent by the Committee in most anxious deliberation; and it was not till the evening that they produced a Report. This Report was in the following terms:—

"In respect to the necessity of personal holiness, the Alliance are of opinion that it is recognised in the Article of the basis, on the work of the Spirit; and in reference to various social evils existing in countries within the circle of this Alliance, such as the profanation of the Lord's-day, intemperance, duelling, and the sin of slavery, they commend these and similar evils to the consideration of the branches; trusting that they will study to promote the general purity and the Christian honour of this confederation by all proper means. And in respect especially to the system of slavery, and every other form of oppression in any country, the Alliance are unanimous in deploring them, as in many ways obstructing the progress of the Gospel; and express their confidence, that no branch will admit to membership slaveholders who, by their own fault, continue in that position, retaining their fellow-men in slavery from regard to their own interests."

It will be seen that this Report is identical with the deliverance of the General Assembly of the church on the subject of intercouse with American churches in which there might be slaveholders. This the *Patriot*

Patriot Oct 5. 1846

very readily admits, declaring the Report of the Committee an embodiment of Dr. Duncan's distinction between slave-having and slave-holding. We may hope that the assailants of the Free Church may now be brought to admit the propriety of her conduct, since it has received the ratification of collective Christendom, and may desist from their fruitless attempts to injure her by their calumnious aspersions. But even this Report was not final. The American brethren resumed the discussion on the following Monday, declaring that, were the Report to remain as the deliverance of the Alliance, it would both prove detrimental to the best interests of the slaves, retarding grievously the prospect of effecting their liberation, and would endanger their friendly relations and intercouse with a portion of the American churches. The whole day was again spent in solemn and anxious deliberation; and not till late in the forenoon of Tuesday were the Committee able to agree in a Report. That Report was essentially a change on the plan of general organisation, or rather, a suspension of the attempt to form a general organisation.

(From the *Sheffield Independent.*)

We insert in another column an article on the admission of persons implicated in slavery into the Evangelical Alliance, and the defence made by Dr. Cox, of New York, just before he and his brethren sailed on their return home. Dr. Cox's plea for preserving amicable relations with slaveowners,—for hating slavery in the abstract, and keeping upon good terms with slaveowners in practice,—is no doubt a very convenient one. But we in England, who look upon slavery as it is, with minds unsophisticated by any of those influences which have corrupted so lamentably a large portion of the people of the United States, cannot accept Dr. Cox's mild and convenient mode of dealing with this evil. Dealing with slaveholders as men, we should deal with them as with the drunkard and the debauchee. We should civilly transact such business as we might have with them, as citizens and tradesmen, but limit the connexion within those bounds. The Evangelical Alliance, however, is not an association which has to do with civil rights or secular business. Its bond of relationship is that of Christian brotherhood, and we would take our stand on the principle that no slaveowner ought to be recognised as a Christian. An attempt has been made to apologise for the Evangelical Alliance in this matter, on the ground that when the American churches were invited to send delegates, nothing was said about slavery, and that, therefore, the Alliance was embarrassed on being called upon to impose *ex post facto* conditions of membership. Then, why was not the convention avowedly broken up on that distinct ground? Why was not the blunder stated, and why were not its consequences boldly met, sending back men implicated in slavery, to say to their people—British Christians will not own us? Again, we are told that nobody can judge fairly of the conduct of the Convention, who is not acquainted with the discussions. Whose fault is that? Why did the Convention exclude reporters? With what grace can the members say,—You misunderstand us, because we have excluded you from the knowledge of what we have said. We are promised an authentic report at some time; but who knows how that report has been cobbled and doctored, in consequence of the comments that have been made? It is admitted, however, that slavery has rendered impossible the formation of an Evangelical Alliance on the broad basis of including the whole world. We are to have sectional alliances,—a British Alliance, a European Alliance, a Canadian Alliance, a West Indian Alliance; but a Universal Alliance cannot be formed, because American Christians have been so far corrupted by their connexion with slave-owners, that nothing will satisfy them but the entire dropping of the subject of slavery. This is the explanation of a Correspondent of the *Patriot*, who writes authoritatively, and signs himself "Pacificator." But the language held at the Liverpool meeting, on Monday, clearly implied that there was to be a return visit by the English members of the Alliance, to the United States.

THE REV. M. M. CLARKE'S SPEECH AT NORWICH.

SIR,—I have read, with surprise and regret, a letter in your Journal, dated the 26th instant, signed "William Brock."

I was present at the meeting to which Mr. Brock refers, and listened attentively to the speech of "a Rev. M. M. Clarke, from the United States," which has excited such indignant reprobation from Mr. Brock. That speech appeared to me to come from a black man fully conversant with the evils of slavery, and with the vast difficulty of dealing with this abomination where it is the law of the land, where none can oppose it without infringing those laws, and where all are, in a certain sense, compelled to tolerate it; where many enlightened Christians sigh and groan, longing to be delivered from it; where many, even Christians, are in a state of miserable delusion about it, but where the most glory in their shame, and love this horrid darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.

This poor black Methodist brother, "a Rev. M. M. Clarke," I seem to have viewed from a different standing-place to Mr. Brock. Here, thought I, is a poor black man, whose back, may be, bears the marks of the slave-thong; and he comes to us, warm Anti slavery people as we are, and tells us, You must, much as you, and I too, hate slavery, find a corner in your hearts for some charity—not to slavery, —no; but to some slaveholders—men whom he says he knows and loves, who hate slavery, and are real Christians, and one of whom he pourtrayed to us (albeit somewhat impatient hearers,) as a type of this anomalous section in a slave state. Perhaps his charity extended also as far as to those who are miserably deluded in this matter; and if the heart of this poor man beat right, it was a noble lesson for us. Love your enemies, pray for them that hate you and persecute you.

We have just, as a Christian people, bought twenty millions worth of emancipation, and are willing to pay a million a-year for it for ever. But viewed from one standing place, we may seem to have compounded a felony, and to have awarded to transgressors not stripes, but solid gold. Viewed from another, we may ask of Christian charity to view us as willing to be punished for our own iniquities, if not by stripes, by a heavy fine.

When John Newton wrote his "Letters to a wife," from a slave-ship, and went from manacling slaves according to law, to writing tender letters to his wife according to the Gospel, was he a Christian world's anathema, or was he what we took him to be, a broken-hearted Christian? And, if so, may there not be Cardiphonian John Newtons in the Southern States, and, if so, what should "the Rev. M. M. Clarke," the black slave brother, tell us to think of them?

John Newton, we are told by his biographer, had not the least scruple as to the lawfulness of the Slave-trade; he considered it as the appointment of Providence, and viewed this employment as respectable and profitable.

Beware, then, I beseech you, warm-hearted, generous, chivalrous, anti-slavery, white Christian brother, lest you tilt your Christian spear against the sides of Christian charity. Indeed, I fear you have already wounded your poor black brother, and needlessly offended one of these little ones.

Christian charity is infinite, for "God is love." The Evangelical Alliance may do more than has yet been done for the cause of the slave, by forming a Union so full of this holy fire that it shall burn out slavery, by making the weapons of its anti-slavery warfare, not carnal, but spiritual, and by saying even to these southern states' Philemons,—Yea, brethren, "Let us have joy of you also in the Lord; refresh our bowels in the Lord."

I am, Sir, yours sincerely,

THOMAS BRIGHTWELL.

Norwich, 30th Sept., 1846.

SIR,—Since my last letter to you I have had an opportunity of reading a perfect copy of the speech of the Rev. Mr. Clarke in Norwich, on the subject of American slavery.

I have compared that speech with the letter of Mr. Clarke to myself, which you kindly inserted in your last number, and my conviction still is a strong one, that Mr. Clarke did attempt to exonerate the slave-owners of America, who are professors, from all culpability, and that he expected all members of the Evangelical Alliance to exonerate them also. The statements made in his letter do not, in any material point, affect the statements made in his speech.

I have, therefore, no alternative but to repeat the sentiment of my first communication to you on this subject; and, barring any word or sentence that may be rightfully offensive to the Evangelical Alliance or to Mr. Clarke, to declare that that communication was not only warranted, but demanded by the circumstances of the case. Were corroboration of my opinion requisite, I might find it, in abundance, from a lare public meeting of last evening, of which I hope your next number will have a full account.

I say to your readers what I said to some 2,000 of my neighbours last night,—Beware lest the influence of the Evangelical Alliance be used at least to enervate and render practically inoperative the hatred of British Christians to slavery in all its forms. No matter what we say of the enormity of the system, if we vindicate the men by whom it is upheld and carried on.

At more than one Evangelical Alliance meeting they have been, somewhat memorably, vindicated, wherefore my solicitude to put and to keep my fellow-Christians upon their guard.

Any further discussion that may ensue should leave Mr. Clarke out of its consideration, inasmuch as some of the leaders of the Alliance have publicly avowed their belief of the sinlessness of occasional slaveholding.

I am yours, truly,

WILLIAM BROCK.

Norwich, 3rd Oct., 1846.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.

SIR,—There are many of your readers who thoroughly hate American slavery, and are thoroughly dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church in relation thereto; but who, nevertheless, stand in doubt of Mr. W. L. Garrison and his party of American abolitionists.

I was glad to see the letter of "Inquirer" on this subject in your columns, and am not at all satisfied with the off-hand reply of the secretary of the Anti-Slavery League.

I would again entreat, that some competent person will give us a fair statement of the principles and proceedings of the two anti-slavery parties in America.

I have long been perplexed with doubts, arising in the first instance from the perusal of some abolitionist publications sent me from America, in which anti-slavery principles were encumbered with a variety of hobbies and crotchets in relation to other matters, like so many "dead flies in the pot of ointment."

These doubts have been revived and confirmed by some of Mr. Garrison's remarks in this country, particularly by what he said at Exeter-hall on the subject of the Christian Sabbath.

I ask, honestly, for correct information, and shall rejoice if it can be shown that the apprehensions to which "Inquirer" has alluded, and which many of your readers have entertained, are groundless; and that Mr. Garrison and his friends are not, in connexion with their anti-slavery efforts, propagating erroneous sentiments which preclude our bidding them God-speed.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Forest of Dean, October 2, 1846. T. N.

Belfast News Letter Oct 8. 1846

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BELFAST NEWS-LETTER.

DEAR SIR—From the report of proceedings, at a recent meeting held in Belfast, in reference to the slavery question, I perceive you were honoured with a more than ordinary share of vituperation by Mr. Lloyd Garrison, "the itinerant American orator," as he is generally designated, in consequence of your having in the strict discharge of editorial duty, warned your readers of the principles and character of an individual of avowedly infidel principles. Of the unfair advantage taken of the presence of the editor of a public journal at a public meeting, by calling on him to rise at the moment, when unprepared to reply to any charges that might be brought forward against him by an interested speaker, I shall merely observe, that such a proceeding appears to me to partake much more of the character of that species of "Lynch law," which we read of as being practised in some portions of the "new world"—than of the etiquette which, so far as I know, has invariably been observed toward the gentlemen connected with the public press of the mother country. I meddle not with this matter, however, as I feel persuaded "the gentlemen of the press" in the "Athens of Ireland," are perfectly competent to settle it with Mr. Garrison to their own satisfaction. My object in now addressing you is, to disabuse the minds of your readers as to some statements made by Mr. Garrison, in reference to the evangelical alliance, which I, as a member, of that body, and one who attended the meeting of the recent conference, denounce as malicious libels, and totally unfounded.

As it is not my intention to enter into "a war of words" with Mr. Garrison, in reply to his oft repeated assertion that the Evangelical Alliance, either as a body, or individuals, are favourable to any system of slavery, or to slaveholders, I have simply to state a fact which will at once show your readers and the public what dependence is to be placed on the veracity of Mr. Garrison, as well as afford convincing proof that *no slaveholder*, however excellent and upright his moral character may be, or, however sincere in his religious profession, can be admitted a member of the Alliance.

A gentleman possessed of considerable property in America, being anxious, on seeing the circular issued by the Liverpool Conference, to connect himself with the Alliance, resolved on coming to London, to attend the Conference held there; after travelling a considerable distance through the States to a sea port town, he thence embarked for England, and having crossed the Atlantic—presented himself to the nominative committee of the Conference in Exeter Hall, being highly recommended as a Christian brother, by several American gentlemen, members of the Conference. It appearing, however, that he was a *slaveholder*, although he himself was perfectly opposed to the principle of slavery, and would have manumitted the slaves in his service had the laws of the state in which he lived allowed him—still as a holder of slaves he could not be admitted as a member of the Evangelical Alliance, and in consequence had to leave England, and return to America, without attaining the object for which he had undertaken such a journey, and incurred so much expense. In reference to the moral and religious character of this individual, the most unexceptionable testimony was given by Ministers of the first rank and most exalted piety in the American Churches—that in the district in which he lived he was beloved and respected, and that the very slaves in his employment would consider it a severe infliction to be separated from him. It may be said, then why not liberate them at once? The reason simply is, that by the law of the State in which he lived he would be obliged to give the most ample security for their future maintenance and support, in sickness and in health, during the remainder of their lives, and this, at the moment, he is not in a situation to do. He was willing, however, to pledge himself never again to take another slave into his service, and to do all in his power to suppress the slave trade and slavery. Still, *being himself a slaveholder*, he could not be admitted into the Alliance, and, as I have said, returned to America while the Conference was sitting.

This one fact, Mr. Editor, must, I should suppose, satisfy any reasonable mind, that when Mr. Garrison stated that the Evangelical Alliance was favourable to slavery and slaveholders, he stated what was not a fact, and must at once settle that question. In reference to some other assertions made by Mr. G. as to the proceedings and purport of the Alliance, I have only to say that they are all equally devoid of truth, as the one alluded to; for instance, he is reported by his friend, "the *Whig*," to have said that "there is not at present an Evangelical Alliance in existence"—that "the slavery question killed it"—that "whoever says there is, humbugs the public"—that "no other meeting had been announced"—and that "there never would be one"—that "there is no British, or French, or American Alliance now, it had all gone to fragments, and no such thing existed." In reference to the entire of these assertions, I have only to say that there is not one word of truth in any of them—they are not only gross misrepresentations, but downright falsehoods, evidently invented by Mr. Garrison to answer a particular purpose, and that individual must have known they were untrue, for he says in his speech he has read the printed documents of the Alliance—one of which I send you, and you will find from it that it was agreed to at the Conference that another General Conference of the members from all parts of the world should be held, at such time and place as should hereafter be agreed on, but that, in the meantime, meetings of the several divisional bodies should be held in their own districts in England, Scotland, and Ireland, in America and on the Continent, &c., and that a constant communication and correspondence should be kept up between them all, at stated periods. One meeting has since been held in England; others will shortly be held in this country, and no doubt the moment our foreign friends arrive at home they will also hold meetings in their various localities.

Without, therefore, entering at all into the merits of Mr. Garrison's *private* character, or infidel sentiments, I leave it to your readers to say, from the specimens of his veracity I have furnished, who it is that is trying to humbug the public; and am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

P. Dixon Hardy.

Greenfield Lodge, Dublin, Oct. 8, 1846.

Belfast News Letter Oct 13. 1846

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BELFAST NEWS LETTER.

Sir,—I have read, with deep interest, the account given in your journal of Tuesday last of the late meeing in the Music Hall, and I hasten to offer my humble meed of commendation for your dignified and gentlemanly conduct on that provoking occasion. An assault so unexpected, so public, so directly personal and grossly outrageous, would have betrayed most men into forgetfulness of what was due to themselves and to christian principle, intent only on administering what was justly due to the wanton assailant. Apart altogether from higher and better feelings, public opinion must convince your calumniator that, in governing your own spirit, you achieved a triumphant victory over him. While attempting to do you an act of *justice*, as a public character, permit me to offer a few remarks on the subjects that occupied the attention of the so-called anti-slavery meeting.

The speeches of Messrs. Buffum, Wright, Thomson, Douglass, and Garrison, on the subject of slavery, are based upon the gratuitous assumption, that *all who do not adopt their plan of abolishing slavery, are its advocates and abettors*. On this most unfounded and silly assumption they rest their alleged privilege or right to villify and abuse the Free Church, the Evangelical Alliance, the public press, and the great majority of the Christians, lay and clerical, of this country. Not content with pointing to the *supposed* want of compassion for American slaves, and of proper efforts for their emancipation, as defects or blemishes in those whom they assail, they indulge in indiscriminate and wholesale denunciation of them as "hypocrites, knaves, thieves, blasphemers, &c., whose very prayers are a solemn mockery of God!" Not so much for the sake of these "false accusers," as of those who may be led by misguided sympathy to believe their statements, and countenance them in their unholy vocation, I beg to *test the soundness* of the assumption on which they found their charges against individuals and churches.

Is it, then, a sound principle, that *every man is the enemy of a good cause who does not adopt—who cannot conscientiously adopt—the method of promoting it which some of its advocates may choose arbitrarily to dictate and enforce*? This, sir, is the turning point on which hinges the entire subject in dispute between these American agitators and the Christian community in Britain and Ireland.

Let us, therefore, try the case by parallel. At present there are conflicting opinions respecting the best method of saving the poor from starvation. Is every man, who cannot accord with *my* plan, to be denounced as a heartless wretch, who delights in the miseries of the starving poor—as destitute of Christianity, of humanity—as a hypocrite, whose supplications at the throne of grace are an abomination to God? In what state would society, civil and religious, be speedily plunged, were such a diabolical assumption universally acted upon?

Who has not heard the changes rung—*usque ad nauseam*—on the slang phrase, "Justice to Ireland?" Opinions the most contradictory are entertained, by confessedly good men, in what this justice consists, and how it is to be secured. There are two men, in particular, who have borne a very prominent part in the discussion of this subject—W. Sharman Crawford, Esq., M P., and Daniel O'Connell, Esq., M P. Both propose *precisely the same object*, but they are direct antagonists as to the *best means* of attaining it. Which is right? Which is the true philanthropist—the genuine patriot—the sincere, disinterested friend of Ireland? Mr. O'Connell, the clamorous, "monster-meeting" demagogue—who denounces, indiscriminately, Whigs and Conservatives, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, nay, "young Ireland" itself—who wrings from the scanty earnings of a deluded and impoverished peasantry the "utmost doit," and then, as a mercenary hireling, shouts "Hurra for Repeal?" or Mr. Crawford, the liberal-minded citizen, the benevolent and generous landlord, the untiring and unpensioned advocate of every measure that would really benefit his native land, but who never ventures to abuse and vilify every man, or body of men, who cannot see with his eyes?

I would ask again, sir, were all the British Christians, who nobly advocated and successfully accomplished the emancipation of the slaves in the British colonies, a pack of scoundrels, knaves, and hypocrites, because they did not excommunicate and anathematise all others, and "pour out" (to quote the language of "dear Henry" Wright) "a torrent of *Garrisonism*" upon some of the brightest ornaments of the Christian profession? Was the late venerable Clarkson—that distinguished philanthropist, who, but the other day, has gone to his rest—no better than "a wolf in sheep's clothing," and the advocate of the "man-stealer," because he could not erect the standard of freedom on the ruins of charity, and "bless and curse with the same mouth?"

If Mr. William Lloyd Garrison answer the description given of him by his friend, Mr. Wright—if he be the "dear, single-hearted, world-loving, sternly upright Garrison; the friend of God and man"—if he be, indeed, "*the* man and *the* Christian of the nineteenth century" (the italics are not mine)—I would commend to his prayerful perusal—aye, prayerful (for he *does* need "light from God")—the language of the beloved disciple, and the reply of our Saviour—recorded in Luke, ix, 50, and the language of the Apostle James, iv, 11, 12, and he may learn, perchance, to be more charitable in his judgment, and more sparing of his anathemas. If he be not even *a* Christian, and if the bible be not the standard of his faith or his rule of duty, common sense, with his extensive experience, should teach him, that he is exhibiting the most palpable inconsistency, and ruining the cause he professes to advocate, by condemning the tyranny of slaveholders, and reproaching all who condemn it also, but who "follow not with *him*"—*thereby playing the tyrant over a large portion of Christendom*. Who gave him authority to stretch every man on his Procrustes' bed? Who gave him a patent to prescribe to me the *only way* in which he will permit me to seek the abolition of slavery, or fulfil my duties as a free Christian, either to God or man? Is this unconsecrated claimant of infallibility about to dispute with his Holiness the throne of the Vatican? It is surely possible, at least, that many who do not homologate his statements, or approve of his reckless agitation against Christian churches, may be sincere friends of freedom, and may be employing means, not quite so noisy or obtrusive, perhaps, but equally wise, scriptural, and efficient, to accomplish the redemption of the slave. Were his wicked insinuation respecting the *motives* of the Free Church founded on fact, as it is on evil surmises, how does he account for the anomaly, which I do not see noticed by him or his party—"that the large and enlightened body of men from the continent of Europe, who were present at the Alliance, and were in no way implicated in the question, after deliberating separately on the subject of American slavery, *were absolutely unanimous* in vindication of the views held by the American brethren?" I would respectfully invite the attention of Messrs. Garrison and Co. to this curious fact. How did these men steal the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil? He will not, surely, affirm that "the *bagbees* of the slaveholders had found their way into the coffers" of these Continental delegates. To what, then, does Mr. Garrison attribute their unanimous decision? What prompted *them* to offer prayers that were "a solemn mockery"—and to "want God to do an impossibility?"

Another false principle, which pervades the entire agitation of these "anti clerical" orators is, that, in striving for the attainment of a good object, we should unite with all who may choose to unite with us—whether they be good or bad—and whether their purposes be single or sinister. This I hold to be a most vicious principle. All real Christians, [illegible] that it would be a good work to circulate the bible—but I would utterly refuse to associate with the man who should insist on circulating the Apocrypha with the canonical scriptures. It would be praise-worthy to supply the temporal wants of the poor, but I would disclaim all fellowship with the man who should make his alms-giving the purchase money of the poor man's conscience. Just so; it is laudable to reprobate the system of slavery, and seek its abolition by *christian means*; but I beg to be excused from any copartnership with men who devote themselves and receive support, for the very *apocryphal* employment of libelling christian men and christian churches, for no other crime than the *heinous offence of following their own judgment, responsible to God in a matter of christian duty.*

A correspondent of the *Patriot* inquires whether the party in America who act in concert with Mr. Garrison, have not as their object, besides the emancipation of the slave, to leaven the public mind with prejudices against the sacredness of the sabbath, against the organization of christian churches, and against the sacredness of the marriage covenant? If the rumour to this effect be untrue, will Mr. Garrison, or any of his American associates, publicly deny its truth? Did Mr. James Macara, W.S., at a public meeting in Edinburgh, propose to discuss with

Mr. George Thompson, *the principle of slavery?*—and did Mr. Thompson decline the discussion on the principle, but propose to discuss the *point of consistency of the free church, though Mr. Macara was not connected with that church?* If this be true (and the parties can say whether or not), then we have arrived at the root of the matter. Christianity is to be damaged through the Free Church, and under the guise of zeal for freedom.

Is it so, moreover, that in America some of the abolitionists of Mr. Garrison's party have demonstrated their views of liberty, by entering places of worship, creating disturbance, and putting the people to the trouble of carrying them out? It will be easy to contradict these statements, if they are incorrect. And now, sir, a word to Mr. Garrison touching his statements on the platform. He attempted to shield himself behind "Luther, Calvin, Melancthon," &c., in his obnoxious sentiments respecting the christian sabbath; and told his audience that these venerable reformers "asserted that the first day of the week was not the sabbath." True, it is not the Jewish sabbath; but in what portion of their works do they "assert" that it is not the christian sabbath? Are the views of Mr. Garrison on this point identical with theirs? Will he unequivocally state in what precise light he holds the first day of the week—whether it is to be devoted to business, or amusement, or *religion?* Has the obligation of the seventh day sabbath ceased?—is there no christian or first day sabbath?—and does God no longer claim from man a seventh portion of his time for religious worship? Let Mr. Garrison speak out on this nice point, that Christian men may see him without a mask. What does he mean when he speaks of prayer as an "*instinctive* feeling of the soul?" This language may suit an infidel, but ill beseems a professing Christian. In whose heart, since the fall, is prayer an "instinctive feeling?" Not, I presume, in that of Mr. Garrison—nay, nor even in the soul of his modern "Abdiel." Prayer is not likely to be a favourite exercise with the man who imagines he has such noble instincts as Mr. Garrison claims, who disdains to ask, because he *thinks* he does not need, any "light from God" on the subject of slavery. What a brilliant western luminary must he be, with his "two grains of honesty and half a grain of humanity!" Poor man! he needeth help, and yet he scorns to ask! A *Christian* needs "prayers and divine light from heaven," to guide him in his entire conduct, and to "lead him in the way everlasting." Mr. Garrison says he is a reader of the Bible. Where does that book, which describes "vain man" as "born like the wild ass's colt," tell us that he has an *instinctive* knowledge of his duty, *independent of "prayers and divine light?"* Tom Paine was a reader of the Bible, too; and so was Julian, and so were many since his day, who used the "light" given them for better purposes, to "set their mouth against the heavens," and blaspheme the God that is above.

Let not the foregoing remarks be misconstrued, as though they were intended to screen the "man stealer" or slave holder, or the abettors of slavery, from merited condemnation. My design is directly the opposite. It is to protect godly men from the virulent invectives, and calumnious misrepresentations of unprincipled agitators, who would give enlightened freedom to our minds, while they are themselves the slaves of passion, prejudice, and pride. But let not the misconduct of such men weaken the sympathy of the *true* friends of the slave, and the *Christian* advocates of abolition. While they stand forth to confound the reckless calumniator, let them echo throughout all Christian nations the wrongs and sufferings of the unhappy slave, and denounce the vile abominations connected especially with *American* slavery. Let them honestly and indignantly remonstrate against the unrighteous and inhuman enactments that would exclude the poor negro from the light of Scripture truth, or that would pander to his degrading lusts, and his master's insatiable cupidity by the profanation of the marriage ceremony, where the tie may be snapped asunder at the caprice of the slave owner or the slave. Let the platform and the press, ring with such denunciations, until men shall be shamed out of the vile abomination, and be compelled to set the captives free. I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

October 7, 1846. C.

Glasgow Argus Oct 15. 1846

AMERICAN SLAVERY,

THE

FREE CHURCH,

AND THE

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

A PUBLIC MEETING of the members and friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society was held in the City Hall, on Wednesday evening, Sep. 30, for the purpose of receiving Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Esq. and reviewing the proceedings of the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance, in relation to American Slavery. The meeting was numerously attended. On the platform we observed Councillor Robert Smith, Councillor Turner, Mr. William Smeal, Mr. John Murray, and many other respectable citizens. Andrew Paton, Esq. was called to the chair, and opened the proceedings.

Mr. PATON said, I thank you for calling me to the chair. Our meeting this evening is chiefly for the purpose of welcoming our friend, William Lloyd Garrison, to this city, on the occasion of his present visit to this country. Mr. Garrison requires no introduction to your confidence; his well-known name is a passport sufficient to ensure for him a warm welcome from every true abolitionist of slavery throughout the world. From the excellent account of the life of Mr. Garrison which has lately appeared in the *People's Journal*, from the pen of a very talented lady, Mary Howitt, many present are doubtless acquainted with the prominent points of his career, and know that sixteen years since Mr. Garrison was so impressed with the clamant unrighteousness of slavery, that he felt called to devote his energies to effect its overthrow. Though possessed of the most slender means, he then started the *Liberator* newspaper in Boston, to advocate the cause of immediate emancipation for the slaves. In this he has ever since laboured with the utmost fidelity and ability, and with his noble coadjutors has already been successful in bringing about a great change in public opinion in the northern or free states of

America. [Applause.] Mr. Garrison's unswerving faithfulness, his courage and perseverance in tracing and exposing Slavery through all its defences in Church and State, and in a false public opinion—have, as might be expected, concentrated upon him the attacks and calumnies of all in the United States or elsewhere, who are slaveholders or apologists for slaveholders. One singular instance of the intensity of this hatred against him, is that the Legislature of Georgia did some years since offer, and do still continue to offer, a reward of $5000 for his delivery to them. Mr. Garrison proposes this evening, amongst other objects, to review the position of the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance, in relation to slavery. I need not say that we have no difference with either of these bodies, save in relation to the course they have pursued on slavery, which, in our opinion, is unfortunately calculated to exert a prejudicial influence on the cause of the slave in America, by throwing around the slaveholder the countenance of religious men, and the sanctions of christianity, whose mission is to "undo the heavy burdens, to break every yoke, and to let the oppressed go free." [Cheers.] We are happy to have with us also, our talented friend, Frederick Douglass, whose powerful pleadings on behalf of his brethren in bonds, are so well known to us, and have interested so many throughout Great Britain and Ireland. We regret that our friend H. C. Wright, at present in Dublin, has been prevented from being with us on account of his health; up till Monday he expected to be here, but by a letter of that date received this morning, he says that from the state of his health he is reluctantly compelled to stay, as he does not find himself equal to the fatigue of the voyage. We hope for his return to Scotland for a short time, soon. The annual meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society falls to be held about this season, but the Committee have deemed it advisable to defer it for the present, to allow Mr. Garrison, whose stay is limited, more time to bring before us his views on the present position of the cause in America, and the effects which the conduct of the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance are calculated to have upon it.

Mr. W. Smeal then read Mr. Garrison's credentials from the Abolitionists in America, and from the free coloured population in Boston, constituting him their representative.

Mr. Garrison, on rising to address the meeting, was loudly cheered. When the applause had subsided, he spoke to the following effect:—These are the credentials which I lay before this audience to commend me to their confidence and regard, as the uncompromising friend of universal emancipation; and to all the reproaches and calumnies that have been circulated on the other side of the Atlantic, or that are in circulation on this, I point to these credentials for an answer, and no other need be given. With the oppressed and down-trodden coloured population of America bidding me God speed, I feel that I am indeed a friend of liberty, and that the friends of liberty throughout the world should, instead of endeavouring to obstruct my progress, give me the right hand of anti-slavery fellowship. (Cheers.) This is not the first time I have been in Glasgow, and, I hope, it will not be the last. (Great applause.) It was my privilege to stand before an audience in the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw's chapel in 1840, and I never shall forget the generous and cordial reception given to me on that occasion, as the friend of the oppressed slaves in America. I trust I have never faltered in my course since that period, and that my principles are the same that they were then. (Applause.) The position which I occupy is as hateful to the tyrant now as it was then. The blessings of those who are ready to perish are falling on my head now as they were then. I have not gone backwards, but forwards—not downwards, but upwards; and therefore I claim a warm reception again from the free men of Glasgow. [Cheers.] I delight to be in this place for very many reasons. After the abolition of West Indian slavery, so far as England was concerned, the flame of emancipation, so to speak, went out, or burnt very low. There seemed to be a general feeling, that inasmuch as the slaves under the British flag were now rejoicing in their freedom, that enough had been done, and that abolitionists should be discharged from any farther service. But not so in Scotland—not so in Glasgow. There were free spirits here who began their warfare with slavery not because it was a West Indian question, but because it was opposed to God and the rights of man, and should not be suffered to exist anywhere on the face of the earth. [Applause.] Entertaining these views, they set themselves to the work of overthrowing slavery throughout the world, determined till the last chain was struck from the limb of the last slave not to abandon the conflict.—[Hear, hear.]—On another account I am happy to be here. I am an abolitionist—an American abolitionist—and as such, in common with thousands on the other side of the Atlantic, have from time to time been cheered by your voices, and strengthened by your testimonies. The Glasgow Emancipation Society has done almost as much as the American Anti-Slavery Society. I am not speaking in extravagant terms, but I am saying what I believe, when I say that you have done a mighty work towards overthrowing American slavery—towards disheartening the upholders of that system—and towards strengthening the hearts of the abolitionists of America. You did something else, the importance of which has never been sufficiently estimated. I allude to the gift of George Thompson to America, through the influence of the Glasgow Emancipation Society. [Great applause.] Never was aid given at a more timely period, and never was such aid given in similar circumstances, as when the peerless orator—the friend of universal man—was deputed to represent the Glasgow Emancipation Society in the United States of America. And well did he carry out the principles which he had advocated in this country in America. Well did he fulfil his pledge that he would make himself a party with the despised and hated abolitionists, and that he would take his position with the down-trodden slave. [Great cheering.] I need not go over the particulars of his mission to America, with which you are all acquainted, but I may say this, that he was more true to his principles than the needle to the pole, for it sometimes knows vibrations, and he never alters. [Cheers.] I now beg to allude to an introduction which I have received gratuitously to the Glasgow public, through the columns of the *Scottish Guardian*, and which I now desire to make use of in my own behalf. It begins as follows:—

"We do not suppose it will be necessary for us to trouble our readers much farther with Mr. Lloyd Garrison, Mr. Douglass, Mr. George Thompson, or the other American agitators,—who, it will be observed, have been again attempting to get up one or two meetings in Edinburgh, and may, perhaps, repeat the same experiment in our city. Their own exhibitions afford the grounds of their strongest and surest condemnation, and have speedily brought down upon them in this country the contempt with which they have long been regarded by all good men in America."

Why, you have a very strange way of showing your contempt in this country. I have been in the presence of assembled thousands in London, and they have given me the right hand of fellowship—at least I thought so. I have been in various parts of England, and addressed many thousands of the people, and yet with scarcely an exception they have received me with the warmth of brethren, and have done everything in their power to make me understand that we saw eye to eye, and are one in spirit in regard to our abhorrence of slavery. I have met with something of the same kind in Scotland. [Cheers.] I have been at Greenock, Paisley, Edinburgh, Dundee, and in all those places the enthusiasm has been all that my heart could desire, and much more than I could have reasonably expected in view of the defection of the Free Church of Scotland, and their support of slavery in America. [Great applause.] Then as to the contempt of "the good men in America" — the good men who hold three millions of human beings in chains and in slavery—the good men who have from one end of our country to another embraced the spirit of liberty, and endeavoured to destroy her — the good men who are hunting up apologies for those who are putting women under the lash, and are selling babes by the pound—the vulgar—the disorderly—the chief priests and pharisees—the head and the tail—altogether, have given us their contempt; but why should it be otherwise? [Great cheering.] I feel I should have to make myself the basest of the base to merit such men's praise, and I glory in their condemnation. [Applause.] I want no tyrant to praise me. I want the slave to acknowledge me as his friend. That is all I can ask, and it will serve to meet all the minions of tyranny can bring against me, or any other man in a similar position. [Cheers.] The article in the *Guardian* goes on—

"Mr. Buffum and Mr. Wright (Mr. Thompson's correspondent 'Dear Henry,') have already decamped. The others, we doubt not, will soon follow."

No doubt the writer of this is a brave man. No doubt, when the meetings were formerly held in this place, that gentleman was valiant in coming forward and bearding the lion in his den. No doubt, he never skulked—he never took refuge in his own columns where no one else could be heard. [Hear and cheers.] He came here to say "Who's afraid? I will humble these men, or make them decamp." He did not come, and he remained away for some cause. Why, it is only "the wicked who flee when no man pursueth." [Great cheering.] It is only the Free Church which cannot challenge investigation. It is only the apologists of the Free Church who dread a free platform, and who dare not measure weapons with George Thompson, or men who sympathise with the slave. [Cheers.] Wherever I have been, it has been uniformly announced that our meetings are as free for the advocates of the Free Church as for ourselves. [Hear, hear.] I make the same announcement to-night. [Applause.] This is the way we skulk and run away.

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just,
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."
[Great applause.]

As if Mr. Thompson was to continue to reside in Glasgow to prove that he is not deficient in valour. As if Mr. Buffum should have to transfer his residence from the United States to Glasgow to prove he is not a coward. A very reasonable man is this editor of the *Guardian*. The article proceeds,—

"Our readers must have observed that the resolution which was adopted by the Evangelical Alliance proceeds upon the same sound and scriptural principles which have guided the proceedings of the Free Church in relation to American slavery. The consequence is, that the Alliance—composed of excellent men, of all the evangelical denominations in Britain, is at once denounced, no less than the Free Church, as 'an *unchristian body!*'—composed of '*wolves in sheep's clothing!*'—their language is declared to be '*downright blasphemy!*'—and their prayers no better than '*a solemn mockery before God!*'"

I tell the Free Church that she must not lay that "flattering unction to her soul," that she is safe because she has got an ally. [Hear, hear.] I tell her, that "although hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished." [Great applause.] I tell her that although Pilate and Herod are become one for the crucifixion of liberty—that although they have crucified her, and committed her to the tomb, and sealed the doors, and appointed the "Guardians and Warders," to see that none take away the body, yet the watchers shall fall to the ground, a resurrection shall take place, and thus the nations of the earth shall be redeemed and disenthralled. Why, if it be true, as it is true, that the recent Evangelical Alliance has been as base in principle in regard to the anti-slavery cause as the Free Church of Scotland is, does it make out a case in favour of that church? And when two such parties come together, are justice and mercy to go by the board? This Evangelical Alliance, instead of being a support to the Free Church, shall be another millstone about her neck, unless she repents "and brings forth fruit meet for repentance." [Applause.] I have now a remarkable fact to submit to you. The article I am noticing continues as follows:—

"It is a remarkable fact that, while the Alliance included a very large body of American ministers, of twelve or thirteen different denominations, from all parts of the Union, the whole of these men (with the exception of a Mr. Himes, who is a Garrisonian—and, perhaps, one other individual) were unanimous in earnestly denouncing Messrs. Garrison, Thompson, &c. as 'pestilent fellows,' and *the greatest possible obstructors* of the cause of abolition."

I have heard that said a great many times. I have heard it from the lips of the slaveholders for the last twenty years. The men declaring that slavery is the corner-stone of our American edifice—a divine institution, which ought to be perpetuated—are the very men who affect to grieve that I have retarded the progress of abolition at least 150 years. Now, if this were true, instead of offering 5000 dollars for my head, they would have put that money into my pocket. [Hear and cheers.] They would have asked me to go south of Mason and Dixon's line. They would subscribe for *The Liberator*, and not tell me if they catch me, they will hang me. [Cheers.] But when they cannot do that, they affect to grieve that I do what they want done. The American members of the Evangelical Alliance are the worst foes of the anti-slavery cause. They have no flesh in their obdurate hearts. They are mere time-servers, and popularity-hunters—men who love the praise of men more than the praise of God—men who are striking hands with thieves. [A slight hiss, followed by tremendous cheering.] I don't know how to meet a hiss, but I know how to meet an argument. [Applause.] Yes, we had nearly seventy delegates in the Alliance—strong men—men of large intellect, and great influence. But then they are also great advocates of the innocency of slave-holding, and man-stealing, and their intellect and influence are given to the side of the oppressor, and against the oppressed, who have few to plead for them. They are, in scripture language, "wolves in sheep's clothing." They are men who came here to deceive the British public. They say they are opposed to slavery, and really would do something, but for those fanatical abolitionists. Now, when they go to the bar of God, and are asked why they did not open their mouths for the slave, will they say to God that if it had not been for that infidel Garrison we would have done something, but he stood in our way and we stood still? I do not know whether that apology will do or not, but I have an opinion that it will not be good; for if it be true that the abolitionists of America are injuring the cause, then so much more active and untiring should be those who are not abolitionists to see that the cause should not suffer injury, and that the slaves should be liberated from their chains. [Great cheering.] The *Guardian* further says—

"The solemn judgment of such men, and of all the other various classes of evangelical Christians assembled in the Alliance, is not likely to be shaken by clamour and ribald abuse; and we should think most people, who have any regard to their character, will be cautious how they give farther countenance to these agitators in their profanity."

This, Sir, is genuine American pro-slavery. [Hear, hear.] If I had not known that I was in Scotland, and that it is from a Scotch paper I am reading, I should have supposed myself to be in the United States of America, in the midst of slavery, and with one of the American pro-slavery papers in my hand; so true it is, that wherever slavery is to be shielded, the same spirit must be exhibited, and the same low attempts made to cover up with odium the uncompromising friends of freedom. [Great applause.] Can we not settle this matter in a common-sense way without much argument? Nobody denies but that there are three millions of people in slavery. Now, I hold that wherever there is a struggle for freedom there can only be two parties—the one party consisting of the tyrants and the friends of tyranny, and the other party of the oppressed and the friends of the oppressed. No man may say, I am neither with the oppressed nor with the oppressor. There is no neutral ground between them, and you must either be with the oppressed or with the oppressor, whatever protestations may be made to the contrary. [Loud cries of "hear, hear."] Now, where are the slaveholders in America? They are the tyrants. With whom do they sympathise? With the men who were sent to the Evangelical Alliance, who can travel through the slave states and be welcomed to every table, and be honoured and flattered as the true friends of the south. What does this prove? That they are the supporters and advocates of slavery. [Hear and cheers.] In regard to the abolitionists, how do the slaveholders look upon them? With fear and consternation, and as those determined never to give up the contest on behalf of the down-trodden slaves. Where are the down-trodden slaves? They join their hands with the abolitionists Where are the slave population of America to-night? Here; with me in the person of that beloved brother. [Cheers.] Every man of them, every woman of them, and every child in slavery, are represented faithfully and truly in the person of Frederick Douglass. [Great applause.] Then as to the free coloured population, who are treated with great indignity wherever they may go

in the United States, have I not presented their resolutions to-night constituting me their delegate? They are here in my person, and therefore the cause I represent is the cause of the oppressed; and hence you, as the friends of the oppressed, will endorse the principles the abolitionists of America endeavour to carry into effect. [Cheers.] Since I came to this country I have been admonished by some to be careful of my language, and to deal as gently with this subject as I can. I will do so. I desire to be prudent, and careful, and just, and, at the same time, faithful and uncompromising. I desire to remember that I profess to be the advocate of the American slave. I stand here as the slave of America—as one having the chains of bondage around his limbs—as one destined to be put on the auction-block to-morrow—as one denied all his rights as a man—as one whose lip is stopped by the slave-driver—as one who may not read the Bible—as one who may not hear the Gospel preached—and, standing thus, I will be as gentle under the oppressions I am labouring as I possibly can. [Applause.] But on such a theme it is impossible to be calm. Unless we remember we are in bonds with the slaves—unless we feel ourselves the victims of the oppressions and sufferings which they endure, and unless we see with their eyes, and respond with their pulsations, it is impossible truly to sympathise with the slaves of America. I will be as gentle as I can—you must pardon something to the spirit of liberty. I know, in assemblies like this, there are those who lie in wait to catch if possible a wrong word; but I do not want to please such men. What I want is, that I may speak the words that may be given to me in the spirit of truth and in the love of it. What I want is, to beware how I am a respecter of persons—how I shall speak on this subject without exciting the prejudices of the people, and without compromising the standard of rectitude, which God forbid I should do to win the applause of any man in the world. [Immense cheering.] Now, I want to refer to another document in the *Guardian* newspaper, and I am much obliged to the Editor for having copied a part of the speech I lately delivered in Exeter Hall. He seems to think it will excite a prejudice against me as the representative of the American slaves; but I do not believe it will have such an effect; and I wish every newspaper in the world would copy that speech. My observations, as quoted in the *Guardian*, are as follow:—

"He complimented Mr. Hinton in having introduced a motion for the exclusion of slaveholders, but it did not pass. One would have thought they would soon have resolved the subject. But they appointed a large committee to consider the subject. The committee met; solemn prayer was offered that they might have Divine direction. Several persons engaged in prayer, and implored the direction of God. Then after so much prayer, a number more persons were added to the committee. *Now, he denounced all this praying as solemn mockery before God.* In his opinion, if they had done their duty, and had remembered those in bonds, as bound with them, *they would have no need of asking God what they should do.* Why all this delay, if they were not attempting to wrap up the question? The American delegates ought to have been more decided than any other men, for they held the doctrine that all men were equal; and yet *they pretended they had no light from Heaven, and to seek Divine direction. He denounced this language as downright blasphemy.*"

Sir, I did denounce it as such in Exeter Hall. [Loud cheers.] I denounce it as such here, and wherever I go I will denounce it in the same language, and in the same way that I did in London. [Renewed cheers.] What! men needing light from Heaven to know what they shall say or do with three millions of the human race before them in chains—deprived of the Gospel of Christ—denied the marriage institution—and made marketable commodities! Why, if ever there was a body of hypocrites assembled together under heaven, it was the Evangelical Alliance. [Tremendous cheering, mingled with a few hisses.] The old serpent generally hisses when his head is bruised. [Cheers and laughter.] What light did they need? What additional light was it in the power of God to give them? None. They were human beings, and God had given them human feelings and affections, and had required them to love their neighbour as themselves, and had enjoined upon them, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." Had they not the Bible in their hands? Did they not come up at the call of the spirit of God? Did they not come up for the express purpose of redeeming mankind? And, therefore, in respect to these American delegates, no language could describe their baseness and hypocrisy. [Hear and cheers.] Never, I say, since the world began, was there anything which could be a parallel to it. They came from a country where, for seventy years, the American people annually declare to the whole world, in the presence of God, "that they hold it to be a self-evident truth, that all men are born free and equal, and that every individual has an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and yet when the question of the liberation of three millions of the human race comes before them, they profess to be in profound darkness. It was a very intricate and difficult question, and they must have more light. Light! the rogues did not need light. What they wanted was this—two grains of honesty, and half a grain of humanity. [Great cheering.] I am likewise accused of saying, that—

"If a man tells me he finds sanction for slavery in the Bible, if you could find slavery upheld in his Bible, I would put it in the fire. [Cheers.] Slaveholding is not setting a man free, but holding him in bonds. Let him beware how he makes the Bible sanction his crime. *If your God allows men to be made beasts of, then your God is my devil.*"

I did say so; and I glory in it, that, if their God allowed men to be made beasts of, then their God was my devil. Why, that is simply to say we are in Glasgow to-night, or that two and two make four; and this is gravely put into the *Guardian* as something to terrify people with. Now, friends, has God made us for liberty or not? Does any man want to be a slave? "Who so base as be a slave, let him turn and flee!" You, father, don't want to be a slave—you, mother, don't want to be a slave—you brother, sister, husband, wife, child, do not want to be slaves. You abhor the very idea of being made slaves of, and never would submit to being made slaves. [Hear, hear.] How does this happen? There is something in the breast tells us that slavery is from beneath, and never came from above. Why, the American slaveholders themselves have settled the question. "It is a self-evident truth," they say, "that God has made all men free and equal." What is self-evident needs no demonstration. It would be a waste of argument indeed to make this plain way any plainer. Then, I say, if this be so—if we cannot be willing to be made slaves of until our intellects are blotted out, and until our hearts are taken from us, then, if any man gets a book, I care not by what name it is called, and assumes from what he finds in that book, that you and I should be made slaves of, I will put that book in the fire, if you do not; and I will say to the person that God never wrote that book—I will say to him that it never came by inspiration from God—I will say it is an imposture, and I will call upon every instinct of the human heart to bear testimony that it is so. Can it be conceived that God made man with capacities only a little lower than the angels, and yet commanded that we should be made slaves of, and marketable commodities? It cannot be, and therefore I say again, that if any man makes out that the Bible sanctions slavery, then I will tell him that his Bible is of the Devil and never came from God. [Hear, hear.] But I have been endeavouring to maintain for twenty years that the Bible is a glorious anti-slavery volume; and from that exhaustless armoury I have taken my weapons to fight the battle of the slave. From its pages I have drawn my best arguments in favour of the truth of the principles which I uphold. [Applause.] The charge which I bring against the ministers of religion in America is, that as a body they are atheists. They do not believe the Bible. They have no regard for it. He who loves the Bible for one man—for himself—loves it for every man—for the whole human race. [Cheers.] When I see men conspiring to prevent millions of the human family from having the Bible, and making it a penitentiary offence for any one to furnish the Bible to those suffering millions, I feel they do not believe the Bible. [Hear, hear.] I am charged with being an atheist, but they are reverend atheists, and all the worse on that account. God never made a tyrant or a slave. God never made a pro-slavery Bible, and therefore I do not own the God of those who endeavour to prove from the Bible that He sanctions the enslavement and degradation of the human family. In regard to this matter of the pro-slavery Bible, I have before me the last number of the *Congregational Magazine*, in which there is an article from the pen of Dr. Wm. Alexander,

which entirely coincides with my views, and I presume he stands well in this city as a christian man. [Hear, hear.] I am not aware that he labours under the imputation of being an infidel, and although I am not at all anxious to bring forward that gentleman to take any part of the odium which attaches to me from the views which I entertain, I am not ashamed of the Dr. in this particular, and as I believe he will not be ashamed of me, I wish to present him to you on this occasion, and see if he does not confirm every word of mine as to a pro-slavery Bible not being from God. After reading from the article in question, he continued—I hope the *Guardian* will put the Rev. Dr. Alexander in the infidel list next week. Who are making infidels? Who are bringing the Bible into contempt? Such papers as the *Guardian* and *Warder*, and such persons as the leaders of the Free Church, who are giving the right hand of fellowship to those who take away the Bible, and will not allow it to be used by those under their control. [Hisses and cheers.] I do not wonder those friends hiss—they are ashamed of the conduct of the leaders of the Free Church, the whole of whom should be hissed out of their places. [Cheers and laughter.] After reading another extract from the article, he said, "The head and front of my offence hath this extent; no more." Then in regard to another matter of some importance, by way of explanation, I am reported to have said, that, "It was wicked in the Alliance to class men who did not keep the sabbath holy with drunkards," &c. This language is put into my lips. I used no such language in Exeter Hall. I want men to keep the first day of the week holy unto God. They are bound to do it; and I want them to keep every other day of the week as holy unto God, and they are bound to do it. No day ought to be kept in an unholy manner; but in the impressive language of Paul, "Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we should do all to the glory of God." Now, as an effort has been made, wickedly and maliciously, to stir up the prejudices of the people of Scotland on the subject of the sabbath—as the subject has been dragged into the movement by the enemies of the abolitionists, and not by the abolitionists themselves, I beg to say a word or two in explanation of my views, so that the cause of the slave may receive no injury from that quarter. A few days since, I was in Edinburgh, and some person took the liberty to send me a letter in reference to this matter of the sabbath. The writer says, "I should like to know how you and Mr. Wright have given forth those sentiments at anti-slavery meetings. Your doing so is not only contrary to the manner in which anti-slavery meetings should be conducted, but you should have been aware that you were outraging the feelings of your auditors, in giving rise to the idea, that you took advantage of these meetings to disseminate your heartless heresy. So satisfied am I on the point that your views find no sympathy in this country, that if the question was put, 'Whether shall slavery continue with all its horrors, or the benign influences of the sabbath be discontinued?' the former would be carried unanimously." I should like to know how the benign influences of the sabbath can exist in a land of slavery. The letter-writer maintains that the two are compatible, and that sooner than have the sabbath infringed upon, the people of Scotland would rather have slavery and all its horrors. Then they would prefer God's creatures being transformed into fiends. Then they would prefer to become like wild beasts, to tear and rend those they were formed to love. If this is not the case, then it shows that the writer does not know what he is about, and that he needs some farther light on the matter. [Cheers.] I am not here to go into any argument in regard to my views on the subject of the Sabbath. Give me a proper arena, and I will meet any man on Scriptural ground with regard to the validity of my views on the subject. I profess to believe in the Sabbath. I profess to be as orthodox on the subject of the holiness of the first day of the week as John Calvin, Martin Luther, Philip Melanethon, Rogers, Williams, Penn, Fox, Barclay, and Paley, with many others it is unnecessary to enumerate; and all I have to say at this time is, that if for the views which I entertain on the subject of the Sabbath, I ought to be discredited and sent down below, I beg that Luther and all who framed the Augsburg Confession of Faith go down with me—that is all. Oh! the impudence of those who first claim infallibility on this Sabbatical question—who assume their views must be right—and then give over to perdition all who differ from them. What is the fact with regard to the Sabbath question? We have in America, and you have here, people called Seventh-day Baptists. They maintain that the seventh day, and not the first day of the week, is the Sabbath of the Lord, and with the fourth commandment in their hand, challenge their opponents to show that the Lord's day has ever been changed. Then we have those who believe that the first day of the week has been substituted instead of the Jewish Sabbath. Both believe they are right, but shall either party give over the other to everlasting torments, because they disagree on that matter. Then we have many others who entertain different views, such as, that under the new dispensation of the law, they should forget all about time as time, and be at all times in the spirit of the Lord—not waiting for a week to roll round to keep a Sabbath to the Lord. I do not vindicate any of those views; but amidst such contrariety of opinions, is there not scope for Christian charity, and good reason why we should not sit in judgment upon one another about an outward observance of the Sabbath? I say again, that I hold the same views as the reformers and martyrs of old; and I say this, that you may have your minds disabused in regard to my entertaining any notion derogatory to the holiness of the Sabbath. Almost all have heard of the French Jacobins, who abrogated the seventh day and set the tenth day in its place; and, therefore, when the charge of holding unorthodox views on the subject of the Sabbath is thrown out indiscriminately, those who entertain them are apt to be classed with the French Jacobins, who tried to degrade religion, whereas the individuals I refer to assume a higher view of Christianity, and try to raise the standard, and not to bring it down. In one word, the amount of the difference is, the difference between Moses and Jesus Christ. It is an old cry. It was raised 1800 years ago—"This man is not of God, he keepeth not the Sabbath-day." It is the Chief Priests, the Scribes, and the Pharisees who are raising this cry, because we make use of this day for the purpose of raising men out of the pit instead of beasts. [Applause.] The report goes on to state—

"The Rev. John Preston, Baptist Minister, Euston Square, here rose, and said, he was a member of the Alliance, had sat in 19 sessions, and therefore understood it. He had doubted, and more than doubted, during some parts of Mr. Garrison's address, whether he were a friend of Christianity. When he came to that meeting he did expect to hear strong things uttered against the Alliance, but he did not expect to hear Christianity in general undermined, and prayer to God ridiculed."

Now I will say nothing about the ridiculous plight the Rev. John Preston got into when he got upon that platform; I will not quote what I did say word for word, as it is reported in the *London Patriot*, but I will give the reply of my friend, Mr. George Thompson, to the foul imputation of that imprudent man:—

"My beloved friend, William Lloyd Garrison, has been charged with ridiculing prayer, and seeking to undermine Christianity. He did neither the one nor the other. He denounced a counterfeit Christianity, which forgets the slave in its prayers, which fellowships the slaveholder, which talks of love and has no pity; and he preaches a Christianity which opens the prison doors, which binds up the broken heart, which breaks every yoke, and sees a brother and a man in the meanest and most afflicted wretch that was ever left to perish by the way, while the priest and the Levite passed by on the other side. [Cheers.] His ridicule of prayer was not the ridicule of the prayer of the publican, 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' or of the soul, agonising for those in bonds as bound with them; but that prayer which asks God to direct men how they may escape from the consequences of their own abandonment of righteousness, without repentance, and the doing of works meet for repentance. I will remind the friend who brought this charge, that a greater than William Lloyd Garrison once said, 'Woe unto you, Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and neglect the weightier matters of the law,—judgment, justice, and faith. Ye bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and will not touch them with one of your fingers. Ye devour widows' houses, and, for a pretence, make long prayers." [Loud cheers.]

Sir, in America, they do something worse than devour widows' houses; they devour the widows themselves, and then pray to God for direction how to treat a human being. I ridiculed such

prayers. [Cheers.] I said they were blaspheming before God, and I will continue to say so wherever I may go. [Great applause.] I stand up backed by John Knox, a man who did not talk about using "a little circumlocution," when he had to do with the Devil and his works, but who called a fig a fig, and a spade a spade. I will give you his words as they fell from his lips, and strange as it may seem, the passage I am about to quote is the motto of the *Witness* newspaper. It is as follows:—"I am in the place where I am demanded of conscience to speak the truth, and therefore the truth I speak, impugn it whoso list." Now, I have got another excellent motto from another organ of the Free Church, and not entirely unknown to you. The motto of the *Guardian* is, "The people of Great Britain are a free and a religious people, and, by the blessing of God, I will lend my aid to keep them so." This paper is now denouncing the friends of liberty in America, and is endeavouring in this manner to preserve the liberties of the people of Scotland. [Hear.] The paper which justifies all manner of cruelty involved in slaveholding talking about looking after the religion of Scotland! "Send back that money," and then look to their liberties. [Great cheering, mingled with a few hisses.] Never mind the hisses; let us hear them as distinctly as possible; they are music to my ears. I was in Dundee a few days since, and when I arrived there, I found a foul attack upon myself and the cause which I represent in the *Dundee Warder;* and amongst other extraordinary declarations contained in the article, I found the following; and when I read it, I think you who are impartial witnesses here to-night will admit a case of effrontery more striking was never given to the world. The *Warder* says, "that neither the Free Church, nor any individual member of it has ever defended slavery or slaveholding on any ground whatever, far less by any reference to Scripture." Now the whole controversy with the Free Church is upon this,—Is slaveholding under all circumstances a sin or not? The Free Church maintains that it is not; that a man may be a christian slaveholder; and it runs to the Bible and tries to prove its position is a scriptural one; and yet this *Dundee Warder* has the impudence to say that it never attempted to vindicate slaveholding. [Cheers.] How should we wonder at this? Men who go and get blood-stained money to build their places of worship with, will do anything—when convenient. [Great applause.] If they will, to get money, strike hands with thieves, they will lie to save themselves from the exposure of the world. Now, the question at issue is, Does Christianity forbid all slaveholding, or does it not? Was Jesus Christ a slaveholder or a slave-trafficker, and are his followers to be the same? The churches in America, with which the Free Church is in connection, hold that opinion, and the Free Church says they are Christian Churches, and welcome their ministers to their communion and to their pulpits. In the same way, if the Free Church was asked if slaveholding is not a sin, it would tell you—sometimes, but not always. In the first place, slaveholding is not a sin when a Doctor of Divinity is the man who holds the slaves. If he was some poor wretch who does not make any pretensions to piety, it would be atrocious; but it is your Doctors of Divinity who can hold slaves with impunity, because "A saint in crape is twice a saint in lawn." [Cheers.] That is one way, and I will give you a specimen of those D.D.'s, who can hold slaves innocently, without tarnishing his christian character. Just before leaving Boston for this country, a fugitive slave came and put a letter into my hands, and said, "I want you to take this letter to the people of Scotland; I want you to read it to them; and I want you to ask the people of Scotland what they think of the humanity or piety of a Doctor of Divinity, who could pen such a letter as this." The letter is addressed to a person in New York, and is in reference to a runaway female slave. Mr. G. here read the letter referred to, which requested the person to whom it was addressed to put a description of the writer's fugitive slave into the hands of a police officer, that he might apprehend her. The paper, in addition to mentioning the mental characteristics of the fugitive, contained a description of her personal appearance, which was given with disgusting minuteness, and could scarcely fail of raising some suspicions as to the purity of the writer's thoughts. Having finished the letter, Mr. G. continued—He is just the very man for the Free Church—the very man for Dr. Candlish and Co.; he is willing to quit all claim to his slave for a consideration. As to the person who was to send her back, Dr. Cunningham would have had no difficulty of vindicating him on the ground that Paul sent back Onesimus to Philemon. [Great cheering.] Now, I ask, if any language can be found in our tongue to describe the unblushing villany of such a man as this. [Hear, hear.] Claiming to be a divinely ordained minister of God, and yet offering rewards for the capture of his slave, that he might again put her into bondage. There is no language can describe such wickedness. Yet he is the very man for Dr. Candlish—the very man for the pulpits of the Free Church, and will be the very man for such a body, until we get the money sent back. [Cheers.] Again slavery is innocent, when the Free Church gets supplies from the slaveholders. If they did not get the supplies it would be a different thing, but so long as they put money into her coffers, of course it must be innocent. It is also innocent to hold slaves in bondage, notwithstanding the injunction to "break every yoke and let the oppressed go free," in circumstances which God did not calculate upon when he gave that command. There is another case in which slaves may be held innocently: somebody else may do wrong, if we do right; therefore we ought not to do right. When a slaveholder emancipates his slaves that is right, but we are told the law, forsooth, will take them up, and they can sin much more economically than somebody else could. Why, what have I to do with another man's wickedness but to rebuke it. Because I say to another man, "You are my brother; your chains shall fall; I stand to proclaim you free and not a slave;" and then a body of unprincipled men come in and seize the victim, am I responsible for that deed? I ought to do what I have done. They ought not to do what they have done. [Applause.] Dr. Cunningham has stated, that unless slaves are retained in service in the slave states of America, that the good Christians would have to take Irish papists into their families. There you have a case of innocent slaveholding. Irish papists are not to be employed, therefore never take them into service. Treat them as lepers; do not give them any encouragement, and then we shall convert them over to protestantism. Do not attempt to emancipate the slaves; that is gravely put forth by Dr. Cunningham as a very solemn reason against it. [Cheers.] There is another case in which it is very clear that slaveholding is innocent—the case of every American who declares that it is a self-evident truth that every man is born free and equal. We are told that slaveholding is not sinful under all circumstances. Sir, 1800 years ago Christ was born. He came to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord; he proclaimed the redemption of the human race. Yet it is necessary to strive here as in America to convince men that it is a sin to make a beast of their fellow men. The sin has been denounced for 1800 years. Paul was the first who preached an anti-slavery sermon, when he announced at Athens that "God hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth." What will these libellers say to that? [Cheers.] How painful to think that great truth is not fully recognised in Christendom till this day, and that we still have to admonish the people as Paul did, that they are worshipping an unknown God, and do not believe in the brotherhood of the human race. Slaveholding is not under all cases slaveholding. What is a cabbage under all circumstances but a cabbage? What is a hawk but a hawk? What a dolphin but a dolphin, or is it sometimes "very like a whale?" [Laughter.] What is horse-stealing at all times but horse-stealing, if it is not burglary some times? What will the Free Church be at all times until the bloody *bawbees* be sent back? [Cheers.] Slaveholding, if there is any meaning in words, is holding a slave. It is not holding a free man, nor setting him who is in bondage free. Slaveholding is not non-slaveholding. It is slaveholding and holding a slave. What is a slave? He is not a freeman, of course. He is a thing; an article of traffic, which may be bought and sold, and used as property. Then the slaveholder is, under all circumstances, a man-stealer; therefore there can be no innocent case of slaveholding. Oh! but the laws, says Drs. Candlish and Cunningham. Well, what of the laws? Either those laws are righteous, or they are unrighteous. If they are righteous laws, why should they be referred to as a grievance? If it were not for those righteous laws they would do something—something very bad of course—for it is the righteous laws which restrain them from doing the deed. Well, if they are unrighteous laws, what then? If they oppose the commands of God, what then? Why, they are to be trampled under foot—that is all. [Cheers.] They are to be set aside at once as impious, and not to be obeyed, be the consequences what they may, and the eternal law of God put in the place of them. [Cheers.] Either those slave laws are bad, or they are not. If they are bad, being unrighteous, those who obey them are unrighteous men, and may not be recognised among

the followers of the Lord. If they do not obey them, then of course we are not speaking of those who disobey the unrighteous laws, and hence we desire to keep by the issue, and have no red herring thrown in our way, to lead us off the track. I am called an infidel. That is a red herring. Either a man is a slave, or he is not. If he is a slave, he who holds him as a slave, is a robber of his brother man. If he do not hold him as a slave, we have no controversy with him. How are human laws framed? By Parliaments and other bodies of men; but the laws you are under are of God. How was it in the case of Daniel? A law was passed desiring him not to pray to God. He had been in the practice of praying three times a day to God with a loud voice, and with his windows open. His enemies desired to destroy him; therefore they got an edict put forth, making it an offence to pray to God. What did Daniel do? If he had been Dr. Candlish I will tell you what he would have done. He would have said, "I cannot disobey that command—it is a law. But there is no use of praying aloud to God. I will use 'a little circumlocution.' I can as well pray secretly to Him as audibly; I can obey God and yet obey the law." That would have been Dr. Candlish's reasoning. [Hisses and cheers.] Let them hiss at him—why should you object to it, friends? [Cheers.] Now, Daniel said, "I will pray to God as I have been wont to do." It was not necessary that he should open his windows until the law came; then it became necessary as a religious duty, and he would have been false to his God, and never could have prayed to God in a right state of mind, if he had complied with the law. [Hear, hear.] We are told that slaveholding in America is shamming—that the slaveholders are humbugging the state—that they are slaveholders in form as the law requires it, but that they are not so in reality. [Hear, hear.] Now, I do not believe that, for no Christian would acknowledge such a law. He would say, "I am an honest man; I am against the law, and I will not obey it." [Hear, hear.] When Jesus was about to be crucified, they talked about the law, and when the slave is to be retained in bondage we hear the same thing. But who make the laws? The slaveholders themselves, thus tying themselves up to their own impiety. If there is anything in their prayers, let the slaveholders give their slaves passes to Canada, where they may stand up as freed men far from their pursuers. If slaveholding be not in itself sinful, I ask you how you do not allow slaveholding in Scotland? You take it for granted that no man can be an innocent slaveholder. Brother Cunningham may see somebody he wants to benefit, and therefore desires to make him a slave. But you will not allow him, because you say it would be a crime. What have you done with regard to African slaves. You say, that if a man goes and buys a slave he shall be branded as a pirate, and shall be hanged. Why do you do this? Why not allow men to judge for themselves, if they may innocently enslave a fellow-creature? You have not left a single slaveholder alive in the West Indies, and there is not a single slave there. That is assuming that not a single man may hold another man in bondage. Now, that is the issue with the Free Church, which they have not met, and which they cannot meet. Then, again, the Americans settle the question, by saying that "It is a self-evident truth that all men are born free and equal." When I remember that the Americans are the people who put forth that declaration, I blush to think that any man in Scotland would try to make out a case of innocent slaveholding. Do you mean to condemn the Society of Friends, because they will not allow a slaveholder to be a member of that society? Is it not the glory of that society that they keep so sublime and true a position; and if every other religious society would take the same position, where would slavery be? [Cheers.] Nowhere, or in the abstract, where so many people put it already. "Oh!" said the Rev. John Burnet, "I have heard much about slavery in the abstract, and I have gone over globes and maps to find out where the land of abstraction is; but wherever it is, slavery must be horrible indeed, since even slaveholders execrate it with all their hearts." [Great cheering.] You do not condemn the Friends, yet, by this logic you ought to condemn them, for they are in the midst of slaves, and if slaves may be held innocently, they ought not only to keep them, but to multiply them for their good. Will any man in Scotland condemn the sturdy covenanters in America, who are exhibiting such a glorious example to the world. [Cheers.] After a fifteen years' struggle against slavery, a number of churches have now a rule that no slaveholder can be admitted to Christian fellowship, and do you mean to say they occupy a false position? Do you mean to condemn the course taken by the non-slaveholding churches in America? Yet if you mean to go with the Free Church, and the Evangelical Alliance, you must do so, notwithstanding that it hath been said—"He who stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." They tell us that slaveholding existed under the old Levitical code; but men blaspheme God who say that he allowed that dispensation. God never brought plagues upon Egypt because of the Israelites being held in bondage, and then gave those he had redeemed liberty to become slavetraders, and slaveholders. One thing more, and I conclude. It is an extraordinary spectacle to God and to the world to see that, while America is becoming anti-slavery, Scotland is becoming pro-slavery. This is the position of the two nations at the present era. A few years back we were all slaveholders in America. After a long and fearful struggle, we have now in a great measure redeemed the nation; and having put on our armour, we are going on conquering and to conquer. But, alas! within the last two years a fearful change has come over the people of Scotland, and Scotland, which was once anti-slavery, is now fast becoming pro-slavery, and men in the provincial towns are running to their Bibles to justify slavery from the Scriptures. Why, it should excite alarm in the breast of every man who wishes to see Christianity rule in the world. When I speak of men running to their Bibles for arguments in support of slavery, of course I speak only of a class, for I bless God the whole people are not contaminated—I bless God there are still many true to the rights of man; and I do not believe that the Church—falsely called Free—is the true Church of Scotland, or that it fairly represents the sentiments of the people of Scotland in regard to this important question. [Cheers and hisses.] All they can do is to hiss. They would like to make slaves of you, but they cannot. They would like to make you the apologists of manstealers, but they cannot, and they are very much distressed about it. The heart of Scotland is still sound on this question, and I call upon you to bestir yourselves, in the name of God and of humanity, and see to it, that that money is sent back to America. [Great cheering.] Come to this resolution, that either the money must go back, or the Free Church shall go down—[applause]—and if she must go down, because of her blood-guiltiness, then the Free Church of Christ will stand all the more gloriously vindicated, and there shall be peace and purity throughout her borders. But remember, it is not enough that you be free yourselves,—

"Old Bannockburn hath yet a tongue,
And Bothwell is not dumb,
And voices from your fathers' graves,
And from the future come;—
They call on you to stand your ground—
They charge you still to be
Not only free from chains yourselves,
But foremost to make free."

Mr. Garrison resumed his seat amidst enthusiastic applause.

Mr. Frederick Douglass, who was received with applause, said, I feel very glad to be in Glasgow, especially to have an opportunity of speaking to you on the subject of American slavery. It seems that the fight for the abolition of slavery in America, like the battle for emancipation in the West Indies, is to be fought upon British soil. Both the friends of slavery and its enemies have appeared in this land, and the community are fast taking sides with the one and with the other party of deputationists from the United States. The deputation from the anti-slavery party is small; the deputation from the pro-slavery party is large—very large. The one and the other met not long since in the city of London. The one calling itself the Evangelical Alliance, and the other calling themselves the reviewers of the Evangelical Alliance. [Cheers.] There are but two parties in the United States on this question, neither can there be long more than two in this country in reference to it. There are but two parties in the United States, I repeat, the slaveholders and the anti-slaveholders—the friends of the slave and the enemies of the slave. We are two—there is no middle ground. There is no serving anti-slavery a little and pro-slavery a little. There is no worshipping at the shrine of slavery and at the shrine of liberty at the same time. There is a strong line of demarcation drawn between the abolitionists in the United States

and the anti-abolitionists—that line is becoming more and more distinct in this country, and the more distinct it becomes the better. The sooner we learn who are the friends of freedom, and who are not, the better for the cause of emancipation in this country. [Cheers.] Not six years ago there were many in this city who did not hesitate to come forward and avow themselves the uncompromising advocates of emancipation, who were called Rev. Doctors of Divinity, and where are they now? They are among the missing. They have ceased to work with us; they have ceased to strike hands with the abolitionists. This platform was once the arena of the eloquence of such persons as Dr. King, Dr. Wardlaw, Dr. Robson, and other eminent Doctors of Divinity in Glasgow. Where are they this evening? One of the slaves for whom they appeared to plead stands here this evening to ask after them. [Great applause.] Well do I remember how my heart throbbed with gratitude to those men when I read their speeches on the subject of emancipation. I remember how my heart was thrilled when I read the speeches of Dr. Wardlaw and those of George Thompson in relation to this subject. But where are they to-night? Where is Dr. King, Dr. Wardlaw, and Dr. Robson? Have the slaves in the United States given these gentlemen any offence? Have the slaves behaved in any manner to justify them in giving up the cause of abolition, and abandoning them to their tyrant masters? [Hear, hear.] I think not; but if they have, these gentlemen should tell us what they have done to lead them to pass them by on the other side. [Cheers.] My object in rising, however, at this period is to say a few words about the Evangelical Alliance. We have had some meetings in this country since I had the pleasure of addressing a Glasgow audience. A number of things have transpired tending to give the question a different complexion to that which it wore when I was here before. Since I was here, the Free Church General Assembly was held at Canonmills. Since I was here, the Evangelical Alliance has held its sittings. Since I was here, the World's Temperance Convention has met in London. Since I was here, the United Secession Synod has declared that it would countenance no Christian union with slaveholders. [Cheers.] Since I was here, the Relief Synod has declared in favour of non-Christian fellowship with man-stealers. [Applause.] Since I was here, the Irish Presbyterian Assembly has denounced slaveholding as man-stealing. All these and other circumstances have transpired, tending to give a different complexion to this question to what it presented when I was here some months ago. But one of the principal things which has taken place was the holding of the Evangelical Alliance. The Evangelical Alliance is a high sounding title. Let us trace the history of the connection of the slavery question with this distinguished body. A preliminary meeting of this Alliance was held in the town of Birmingham, and before that meeting came the question of American slavery, and the question as to how the Alliance should regard American slaveholders, or slaveholders, no matter from whence they came. The question, I am told, was sharply debated, and the Rev. Dr. Candlish brought forward a resolution embodying the proposition, that slaveholders be not invited to attend the Alliance. This resolution was agreed to, and was soon published in this country and in the United States. Slaveholders and non-slaveholders saw it. The former were well acquainted with the fact, that they were likely to be placed under the ban of exclusion if they attended the Alliance. It was not that slaveholders be excluded from that Alliance, but that they be not invited to that Alliance. With this resolution looking them in the face, some seventy ministers left the United States for the purpose of attending the Evangelical Alliance, then to meet in London on the 18th of August last. They came a united body. There are no two parties in America among the friends of slavery. They came to London, and the Evangelical Alliance was summoned together. They met together in convention, and one of the first acts of that Alliance was to shut out the light—they excluded reporters, which was to say, in effect, "We are about to do an act—we are about to have such deliberations—such devil's work is to be done as it will not be safe for the world to see. We will exclude all reporters; if we have deeds of diabolism among us, we will at least shut out the eyes of the world." What would have been thought of a body of Roman Catholics doing this? It would have been said that it was perfectly in keeping with the practices of that body; but I will not repeat what the people say about the Evangelical Alliance for doing the same thing. Did they look as if they desired to be inspected of men? Why, Christians, in the language of our blessed Saviour, are represented as cities set on a hill; but the very first thing the members of the Evangelical Alliance did, was to put themselves under a bushel, to extinguish from them the light of investigation. [Cheers.] But although the discussions could not be had in full, there were some in the camp who reported the meetings of the Alliance. During these sittings there was a great outpouring of love; the American brethren loved the British brethren, and the British brethren loved the American brethren. [Cheers and laughter.] Never was there such demonstrations of Christian regard, of Christian love, and of Christian sympathy. In the midst of all this the question arose, What shall be our basis? On what terms shall individuals be admitted into the branches of our Alliance. They agreed to a certain form of creed; but there was a Dr. Hinton among them, a man tinctured a little with the spirit of anti slavery. He knew that there were certain men in the United States who held precisely the same views of the basis recommended, and who made as high pretensions to evangelical faith as the Alliance itself, but he knew these men were slaveholders, and he desired to add to the basis a clause which would prevent slaveholders from being admitted into the Alliance. Greater agitation could not have been produced by the throwing of a bombshell into the midst of the Alliance itself than the raising of this question. It produced the greatest possible excitement. Those brethren who loved so much, and who had come, many of them, 3000 miles to embrace each other, were in arms in an instant. The bond of their unity had burst assunder. Angry discussions arose; and the evangelical man-stealers would not unite with the others if slaveholders were excluded from that Alliance. Dr. Patten said, he had come 3000 miles to attend that convention; and when he started from home, he had no idea that they intended to make a British child of it. He had no idea of its being made an anti-slavery Alliance. He need not have been afraid, as you will see. The discussion grew angry. The American brethren can be warm and speak out strongly. They deal in brimstone, fire, thunder, and lightning, and such figures of speech. [Cheers and laughter.] They have not learned, as Dr. Candlish has done, to use "a little circumlocution." [Renewed laughter.] They said to the Alliance, if that amendment of Dr. Hinton's passes, we must leave the Alliance. They had loved each other very much before. [Laughter.] They loved the Alliance still. In the language of Mark Antony they did not "love Cæsar less, but Rome more"—they did not love evangelical truth less, but slavery more. They said in effect, if you pass a resolution excluding our dear evangelical manstealers from your Alliance, we must go out of it. Well, at this point some of the British brethren became faint at heart and pale in the face, and up they rose one after another and spoke in the following strain.—"We would exhort our brethren to be calm. We hope that nothing imprudent will be done. We do hope that we shall yet be brought to a judicious decision on this question. Remember the eye of the world is upon us—the eye of Protestantism is upon us—and, what is more, the eye of Rome is upon us. If we should separate on this question, oh! what will become of us. We would, therefore, move that this whole question be remitted to a committee." It was at once seconded, and the question of slavery was referred to a committee. That committee was made up to a large extent of the American deputation—Drs. Cox, Patten, and others of the Presbyterian manstealing order in the United States. They discussed the question. They examined it by day and by night for six days. About the middle of the week, the Rev. Dr. Smythe, of South Carolina, I believe, the gentleman who invited the deputation of the Free Church to the south, and recommended them to the cordial sympathy and aid of the evangelical manstealers of the Union, rose, and begged that the Committee be instructed to take time—not to decide hastily—and in their absence he recommended that the Alliance should pray for the brethren composing the committee, and that they might come to an enlightened decision. This Dr. Smythe is the same Dr. Smythe who gets his living in South Carolina for preaching to a congregation entirely composed of slaveholders—he is the same Dr. Smythe who marries slaves, leaving out the important part of that solemn ceremony, which says, "Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." He is the same Dr. Smythe who lives in the midst of slaveholders and slavedrivers, and never opens his mouth against slavery—the same Dr. Smythe who is the unblushing advocate of slavery

—if not the actual owner of slaves in America—and yet this Dr. Smyth asks the brethren to pray, and they did pray. [Cheers and a slight hiss.] I am not ridiculing prayer; I am ridiculing that kind of prayer, and that kind of union which exists in the slave states of America, and which existed in the Evangelical Alliance. We have a great deal of this kind of piety in the United States, and it was very manifest in the Evangelical Alliance. I speak of that Alliance as an injured man—as one whom that Alliance has neglected—as one whom that Alliance has stabbed to the heart, and I will speak out, let who will condemn me. [Cheers.] Sir, there is a recreant black man in this country going by the name of Clark. He went into that Alliance and there denounced the only true friends of emancipation—the abolitionists. If he goes through this country, as I expect he will, for I expect that the Free Church of Scotland will employ him to go about and defend her, as he has the Judas Iscariot impudence to stand up in defence of her connection with the manstealers of America;—I trust he will be informed that I arraigned him here as a traitor to his race, and as representing no portion of the black, or coloured population in the United States. Let us go on to the question before the Alliance. It was a very plain one, namely, whether a manstealer ought to be regarded as a standing type and representative of Christ, or not? The question was, whether the Alliance would throw the garb of Christianity around the slaveholder, or not. It was a yea or a nay. The committee reported, and a resolution was drawn up, to the effect that the Alliance was confident that all who are slaveholders would be excluded from the branches of the Alliance, who are so by their own fault or for their own interests. Just as if there was a man living who held slaves for any other person's interest but his own, or that holding slaves could be the fault of anybody else but the man who held them. This was base and mean; and I find that even the eloquent Dr. Wardlaw who had stood up as the friend of the negro, deserted him, by agreeing to this abominable compromise. Dr. King and Dr. Robson were silent in reference to the compromise, men who should have spoken out beyond all others, especially as the United Secession Synod had declared for no union with slaveholders. This conclusion come to on the part of the committee was for a time quite satisfactory to the American deputation. It was satisfactory in the morning, but unsatisfactory in the evening. They turned themselves round; it was a great improvement on the proposal of Dr. Hinton, but after all it was not what the American brethren wanted, and they refused to consent to this compromise. They demanded that the matter should be re-committed, and proposed that they should go about it in the midst of prayer and fasting, and they actually wanted their dinners. [Laughter.] This produced a wonderful sensation in the Alliance. Such was their zeal for evangelical manstealing and evangelical manstealers, that they could not eat. Their appetites left them, and it was made a matter of awful solemnity that those brethren could not eat. [Cheers and laughter.] After this the American deputation demanded that every trace of the discussion, and of the resolution referring to slavery, should be erased from the records of the proceedings of the Alliance. Three millions of human beings in slavery, in the American plantations, were imploring the members of the Alliance to open their mouths in their behalf, and to condemn those who enslave them; but the American deputation said, no such condemnation shall appear in the proceedings of the Alliance. Sir, that Alliance acted like a band of infidels rather than of Christians. At the bidding of those American manstealers, the English, and Irish, and Scotch members expunged from the record of their proceedings every word of condemnation of slaveholding in the United States. I hold, that no body of men could be gathered together from any quarter in this country but ministers who would have been guilty of this deed. [Cheers.] Amongst no body, however degraded, but there would have been some to speak out in condemnation of slavery. Yet those men of high profession passed by on the other side, and never raised a whisper in condemnation of the system,—in effect saying, as far as the Evangelical Alliance is concerned, "Go on, plunder the slaves as you will, the Evangelical Alliance will not utter a word of condemnation against you." [Great applause.] Let me say one word about the Free Church of Scotland; for it has taken shelter behind the Evangelical Alliance, and I want to say a word about the recent General Assembly of the Free Church. I happened to attend the Assembly, and I heard the speeches delivered on that occasion on the subject of slavery, and I heard the thunders of applause at the end of each sentiment, which looked like upholding the system of slavery. I could not before have believed that such sentiments would have received any degree of commendation from any of the people of Scotland; yet in Canonmills I heard the most infamous—the most blasphemous—sentiments uttered amidst applause, in defence of slaveholding, and in defence of the christian character of slaveholders, which I ever heard in any place. I heard Dr. Cunningham say that Christ and his apostles would not only have sat down at the communion table with slaveholders, but that they would have sat down at the communion table with slaveholders who had a right to kill their slaves if they would, and never rebuke them. I heard him try to bring the idea that slaveholding is sin, and slaveholders sinners, into contempt; and I am sorry to say that he was heard, by some three thousand in number of an audience, with seeming approbation. The battle of anti-slavery is to be fought here not with the infidels, but with the Doctors of Divinity of Canonmills—the God sent, God qualified, and God appointed preachers of the salvation of Christ. Those are the men who stand up as the indefatigable enemies of the down-trodden slave—who stand up in defence of men who drive to toil, to torture, and to death, three millions of their fellow men. [Cheers.] To prove that slaveholding is not sinful in itself, Dr. Cunningham put forth the following argument. After admitting that Mr. M'Beth had fairly stated the question when he said it was plainly, Whether slavery was not in all circumstances a sin? he said Mr. M'Beth had stated that it was in all cases a sin; but he took the opposite side of the question—he took the ground that it was not always a sin. He thought that slavery might be a sin, and not the slaveholder a sinner. Suppose, he said, on the 1st of June next, the Parliament should pass a law declaring all domestics to be the slaves of their employers. I know that I should be a slaveholder, but could any man charge me with sin? "Hurra, hurra," shouted the Assembly, an innocent case of slaveholding has been made out. [Great laughter.] When they heard him putting the case, and admitting that Mr. M'Beth had rightly stated it, the whole Assembly had solemn faces, and seemed to be very concerned as to what great feat this mighty doctor would perform. When he put forth his argument, however, the enthusiasm was perfectly astounding. But let us look to the argument and try to test its validity. If it is good in one case, it is good in another. Let us take the case of polygamy—a sin not to be ranked with manstealing, because that, being the greater, comprehends it and other sins. Suppose on the 1st of June the Parliament were to pass a law declaring that all female domestics are to be the concubines of their employers, Dr. Cunningham would be a polygamist; but I ask would he stay in that relation to his domestics? [Hear, and cheers.] I do not know that he would not. I certainly heard nothing in his speech to convince me that he might not. Why not? If in the one case, why not in the other? If he could become a slaveholder because the law declared him such, why not become a polygamist because the law declared it to be right? [Loud cheers.] Would Dr. Cunningham's argument have been received in any other case? In no other; and I maintain you are not safe in the company of such men, for those who will apologise for the stealing of black men, will apologise for the stealing of white men. [Hear, hear.] The man who will steal black horses will steal white ones. [Cheers and laughter.] The man-stealers of America are upheld and sustained in their system of plunder by such arguments as that used in the Free Assembly; but I hope the people of this country will see to it that those using them do not go unrebuked. Let not the *Warders*, *Witnesses*, or *Guardians* suppose that the cry raised against the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance is to be but a nine days' wonder. We will not be stopped by any impediments that can be thrown in our way. They speak of a decline of the interest on this question; but I would like to see it. I was in Dundee and various other places with Mr. Garrison, where we held meetings six months ago, and so far from the interest having declined in that time, it had doubled, and the hearts of the people are as ready to leap up at the voice of freedom as they were before. [Cheers.] They are as ready as ever to raise that cry, which has given the Free Church more pain than any thing else, "Send back the Money," and will keep up the cry, however long it may be, till the money is sent back. [Applause.] We do not mean to lose sight of the Free Church by talking of the Alliance; and, as an individual, I will not be driven from my course by any thing the defenders of that Church can say of me. They have struck hands with slaves. I am a slave, and I do not expect, therefore, they will speak well of me.

They indorse the Christianity of the slaveholders of America; I do not expect them to indorse mine. They are on the side of the oppressor; I am on the side of the oppressed; I do not expect they will commend me. [Great cheering.] These men have stolen the garb of heaven, the sacred name of freedom, to cover up the deeds of deep damnation of which they are guilty; I am for tearing asunder that garment—I am for revealing the character of these manstealers—and exposing them in their naked deformity. It is not to be expected that they will speak well of my friend Garrison or of me, who come accredited by the tears, and groans, and grateful throbbings of three millions of human hearts in the United States. I look to them for consolation, and not to the Free Church of Scotland. After pronouncing a high eulogium upon Mr. Garrison, he said it was no wonder that the *Guardian* and the pulpits of the Free Church fulminated against him. He was determined, he continued, to keep the conduct of the Free Church before the people, and with God's assistance, he meant to go over the length and breadth of Scotland, proclaiming in the ears of all its supporters, "Send back the money." [Cheers.] When they asked him if he believed in the Sabbath, he would reply "Send back the money." If they asked what church he belonged to, he would reiterate "Send back the money." If they asked him to come and join their church, not a supposable case, he would say, "Send back the money." In all and every circumstance, he would tell them to "Send back the money;" and wherever he met any of them he would look at them in such a way, as would make them feel that they are a brotherhood of thieves. [Applause.] If a Doctor of Divinity put the price of blood into the treasury of the Free Church, he would look upon him as a thief and a robber. If he defended the selling of human beings to build up the Free Churches, he would charge that Church with being a brotherhood of thieves. What was it to be a thief? It was to take or receive that which justly belonged to another. It was universally the opinion in Scotland, he believed, that a man was entitled to the fruits of his own labour. Even the Free Churchmen would admit that. The *Guardian* called him a chimney sweep, and he had been a chimney sweep, but he had never in all his experience met with so black a job as this Free Church business. He was no other man's property; his labour was therefore his own, and the Free Church of Scotland had no right to it. The Free Churchmen admit this, because they don't hiss. [Cheers and laughter.] The Free Churchmen, by their silence, admitted that when they were guilty of taking £3000 from the slaveholders of America, which belonged to the slaves, being the fruits of their labour, that they were a brotherhood of thieves. After a few further remarks, he said that the contributions to the Free Church were £2000 less this year than heretofore, and that if six month's agitation had produced this falling off, he had a notion other six months would have a still more marked effect, and concluded by saying that the honest portion of the members of the Free Church who left the Establishment had greater reason for coming out of that Church than for coming out of the other. [Great applause.]

On the motion of Mr. Garrison, a vote of thanks was given to Mr. Paton for his conduct in the chair, and the meeting separated.

Glasgow Argus Oct 15. 1846

LADIES' ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

On Thursday, the 1st current, a numerous and respectable meeting of Ladies was held in the Trades' Hall, at one o'clock P.M. to hear addresses from Messrs. Garrison and Douglass, on the subject of American Slavery.

The Rev. George S. Ingram having been called to the chair, said—My esteemed friends, I feel grateful for the honour you have done me in calling me to the chair. It is a position rather novel to me, inasmuch as I never before presided at a *ladies'* meeting; and being a bachelor, I am somewhat apprehensive that I may not so efficiently fill your chair as a married gentleman might do. One qualification, however, I think I possess, and that is, a deep and earnest sympathy with the poor, down-trodden slave, in whose behalf you are now assembled. The first tale of suffering I remember in childhood to have heard was from the lips of my mother, respecting the history of a negro whom she personally knew, and who had been brought by a gentleman to this country. The sympathy for the slave which that thrilling story of woe awakened in my breast in childhood, has grown with my growth and strengthened with my strength. So, if strong sympathy with the object of a meeting be a necessary qualification in a chairman, I trust I possess at least this one. [Applause.] I need not remind you of the sacredness and benevolence of the enterprise in which you are embarked; nor of the noble part which the Christian women of Scotland acted in the late struggle for the emancipation of the slaves in the British West-Indian dependencies. You accomplished in that an honourable and a decisive triumph; and doubtless you never dreamt that you would again require to contend on British soil, and far less with British Christians, in behalf of the injured slave, in any quarter of the globe. You formerly had to do battle with the West Indian planters only, whose Christianity but few would offer to endorse. But matters are different now. In pleading for the slave *now*, you have to contend with men holding the office of the Christian ministry. You have to oppose the largest and most influential religious body in this land, who have lately welcomed to their fellowship the slaveholder, and have solicited and received the proceeds of his nefarious traffic in the bodies and the *souls* of men, to build their chapels and to pay their ministers. And you have to oppose the leading men in other denominations who, although their Churches have, as such, declared against fellowship with slaveholders in America, are yet conniving at the conduct of those who here welcome to their communion the man-stealer. They wish to assume a neutral position in this matter; but they forget that the cause of bleeding humanity is the cause of God, and that towards it no neutrality can be justified. "He that is not with me is against me," are the words of Him who came "to bind up the broken-hearted, and to set at liberty them that are bruised." All these are now, either by their fellowshiping the slaveholder, or by their connivance at the doing of it, ranked on the side of the oppressors, and with them you have to struggle in seeking freedom for the groaning and perishing bondmen in America. The thought struck me the other day when writing to a friend on the subject, "What will be the wonder of the future student of Britain's ecclesiastical history when he reads the fact, that in the middle of the nineteenth century, and in the supreme court of a church, who but yesterday had bade defiance to the civil law, and nobly burst her fetters of bondage to the State, and maintained the supremacy of Christ's authority over Cæsar's,—there was, with but one solitary protesting voice, unanimously adopted a resolution to receive within her pale manstealers, oppressors, and the traffickers in the souls of men!" And the not less startling fact, that in the same year, and in the heart of England's metropolis, there was the largest assemblage of ministerial talent, and learning, and professed piety, which for long has been witnessed, met avowedly to promote that love which

> "Glows with social tenderness,
> And feels for all mankind;"

And yet passed a resolution, involving the doctrine that a man may, under certain circumstances, steal, buy, sell, and brutalise his fellow-man, and yet be a good Christian! "Tell it not in Gath—publish it not in the streets of Askelon." But it is already chronicled in history, and these two facts shall lie as the darkest and foulest stains in the annals of the British churches. [Cheers.] It is for you to accomplish what shall create a redeeming fact, to stand recorded on the same page—the fact that among British Christians there were some who "had not bowed the knee to Baal"—some who still had hearts that felt for oppressed humanity, and who never swerved from their simple but glorious purpose of making the bondman free! Yes, your cause *must* ultimately prevail. You have the sympathy of all that is great and good in the intelligent universe of God! The sympathy of the departed and now glorified spirits of the prophets, and apostles, and martyrs of every age is with you! The sympathy of those angelic spirits who minister before the throne of the Eternal is with you, for they sang "peace on earth and good-will to men!" And, above all, you have the sympathy of Him who left the abodes of celestial glory, and tabernacled and died on earth, to emancipate man from every form of bondage, and introduce him for ever into "the glorious liberty of the sons of God!" Yes, He is with you, and who, then, can be against you? [Cheers.] Let us, in this

112 Glasgow Argus Oct 15. 1846

hallowed and benevolent enterprise, apply the encouraging counsel of the inspired champion of mercy and of truth—"Be not weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." [Applause.]

The Chairman then introduced Mr. Garrison, who delivered a lengthened and most interesting address on American slavery, and on the duty of Christians in this country to promote, by every means in their power, its Immediate and Total Abolition. He gave a description of the labours, trials, persecutions, and sufferings of the abolitionists in the United States; especially of the indomitable zeal and energy of the anti-slavery women of America, who had, from the very commencement of the struggle in behalf of slave emancipation, been the main support of the cause, and owing to whose unwearied efforts it was that the American Anti-Slavery Society had not long ere now become entirely paralysed. Mr. G. related a number of most atrocious instances of cruelty and oppression exercised towards females and their offspring by the slaveholders, as manifested in the separation of families, &c. and concluded by contrasting the repugnancy of such a system of wickedness being supported by the Churches in the United States, with the blissful effects that are the product of the pure, and peaceful, and loving spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ; exhorting his audience to continued effort in behalf of the down-trodden and the oppressed of every clime.

Mr. Douglass gave a brief, yet neat and touching address, which we regret our inability to give at length; after which, the following resolutions, having been moved and seconded, were unanimously passed.

"1st, That this meeting of the Glasgow Female Anti-Slavery Society have much pleasure in receiving a visit from Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, of Boston, United States, to whom we give the most cordial and hearty welcome; and beg to express to him the high sense we entertain of his long-continued, able, and devoted exertions in the cause of the oppressed slave, and assure him of our earnest prayer, that he may be long spared to lead on the noble band of abolitionists in America, who have taken the ground of 'No fellowship with Slaveholders.'

"2d, That we renew our expressions of confidence in the American Anti-Slavery Society, and engage to sustain their efforts by every means in our power,—particularly, by the contribution of articles suited to the annual bazaar of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society.

"3d, That we continue to approve of the exertions of the *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, and of the *Scottish Anti-Slavery Society* in Edinburgh, to make known to the members of the Free Church, and to the people of Scotland, the injurious effects to the abolition cause of the course pursued by the Free Church in holding church fellowship with American slaveholders, and taking pecuniary contributions from them to support the Gospel in Scotland; and we earnestly desire that the Assembly of that Church may speedily see their sin in this matter, and retrace their steps.

"4th, That we have learned with deep regret, that the Evangelical Alliance have refused to exclude slaveholders from their membership, and have struck from their records any thing hindering the admission of manstealers. We feel it our duty to declare, that on this account the Evangelical Alliance is not a body to whom we can bid 'God speed;' and we approve of the efforts of the Anti-Slavery Societies in Britain and America, in exposing and condemning the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance in relation to slavery, as unfaithful to the cause of God in the persons of his oppressed children, the slaves of America, held in unrighteous bondage, deprived of the rights of mankind, withheld from the knowledge of the Bible, and the God who made them, by men calling themselves Christians, whom the Evangelical Alliance is yet willing to receive as its members."

A vote of thanks having been given to the Rev. Chairman, the meeting separated; many, we doubt not, deeply affected with the information communicated, particularly by Mr. Garrison. Indeed, we know not that, in the whole course of the anti-slavery movement, there ever was held in our city a meeting of a more interesting and impressive character.

SECOND PUBLIC MEETING

Of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, *in the City Hall, to hear* Messrs. Garrison *and* Douglass,

October 1st, 1846.

Bailie Turner having been called to the Chair, thanked the meeting for this renewed mark of their confidence, although, at the same time, he thought, at his advanced period of life, he ought now to be allowed to retire. [Cheers.] He would, however, endeavour to do his duty so long as ability was afforded him. [Cheers.] He then called on Mr. Douglass to address the meeting.

Mr. Douglass was received with applause, and proceeded, as on the preceding evening, to comment upon and denounce, in his usual manly and eloquent style, the conduct of the Free Church leaders and of the Evangelical Alliance; the former for its continued support of, and connection with, American Slaveholding Ministers and Churches; and the latter for having thrown the whole weight of its influence on the pro-slavery side. He was repeatedly and enthusiastically applauded in the course of his remarks, which, however, we are unable to report more at large.

Mr. Garrison then proceeded to address the meeting at great length. He complimented the venerable chairman on his long-continued attachment to the cause of civil and religious freedom; and pronounced upon him the warmest benediction of his heart. Mr. G. then gave a graphic account of the Anti-Slavery enterprise in America, and the progress of Abolition principles in that country; strongly impressed on his hearers the importance of the friends of freedom in this nation sustaining the Abolitionists of the United States in their arduous labours on behalf of oppressed humanity, by their remonstrances and by their prayers; that so, through God's blessing on the efforts of the advocates of liberty, the demon of slavery might happily be ere long, and for ever, swept from the face of the earth. Mr. Garrison also made a beautiful and affecting allusion to the death of Thomas Clarkson, the patriarch in the cause of abolition in this country, and concluded his animated and interesting address amid loud cheering.

Mr. William Smeal then moved the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. John Murray, and passed amid enthusiastic applause:—

"Resolved—That this meeting hail with feelings of the highest satisfaction, the presence amongst us of William Lloyd Garrison, Esq. of Boston, U.S. the untiring and devoted champion of the downtrodden and oppressed slave; that we thank him for his thus complying with our invitation again to visit Scotland; assure him of our warmest affection and esteem for his character; of our deep appreciation of the value of his labours in the cause of Emancipation,—and devoutly pray, that 'He who looketh down from Heaven, to hear the groaning of the prisoner,' may preserve him in strength and vigour, until the desire of his heart shall be accomplished, in the triumph of universal liberty."

The Rev. George Jeffrey, Secession Church, London Road, moved the following resolution:—

"Whereas, the Free Church of Scotland, in an evil hour, sent its delegates to the slaveholding States of America, to proffer the right hand of Christian fellowship to the polluted and oppressive Churches in that land, and to receive their blood-stained money; and whereas, though more than two years have elapsed since that immoral act was consummated, and, notwithstanding the time allowed for repentance, and the light which has been shed upon the subject, that Church still continues to justify its conduct, and to turn a deaf ear to the cries of down-trodden humanity; therefore—

"Resolved, That this meeting, in the name of the people of Scotland, solemnly renews its protest against the slaveholding position of the Free Church, and affectionately but earnestly implores that Church, by its professed reverence for Christ as its Head, and a wise regard for its purity, prosperity, and its lasting honour, forthwith to dissolve its connection with the manstealing Churches and ministers of the United States, and in proof of the sincerity of their repentance, to

SEND BACK THE MONEY."

Mr. Jeffrey said he should not detain the audience at that late hour of the evening. He had come to the meeting with no intention of speaking. He had come to listen to, and learn from, one whose course in the cause of anti-slavery they had long known; and whom, for his fearless and unflinching faithfulness to that cause, he loved, admired, and honoured. [Cheers.] He had long marked the course of Mr. Garrison. He had been found faithful after long and severe trial. He had been true to the slave through good report and bad report. He had not faltered through persecution, nor failed through flattery; and he was therefore delighted to see him in Glasgow. [Cheers.] He might tell him that he was much loved and much hated—much loved by those who knew him—much hated by those who believed the representations of his enemies, who had long feared him, and maligned him, and persecuted him in the United States. He might say that all this was only proof of his faithfulness to the slave, and fitness for the advocacy of his cause. [Cheers.] What would be the worth of a man behind whom there was only the waveless calm, the slumber of the dead—one who neither aroused praise nor censure. He should hold him unfit for his work. [Applause.] Mr. Garrison's fitness had long been manifest, alike from the voices of praise and blame, of truth and error, of friends and foes. He might tell him that he had not a few friends in this city, who had long known him, and who fully appreciated his devotedness—who delighted to welcome him, now that he was present, and who, if need were, could defend him when he had gone. [Loud cheers.] He should not say much in support of the motion he had read. The Free Church of Scotland had not yet given back the money, and their action in regard to slavery had only strengthened the cause of the oppressor, and put arguments into the mouths of the slaveholding and slavery-protecting Churches of the American Union. He should state a fact to them in regard to the old school Presbyterian Assembly of the United States. Dr. Breckenridge, to use the words of Dr. Cox, in another Assembly, on the same subject, capped the Vesuvius of anti-slavery action in that Assembly, by declaring that they already held the very same ground in regard to slavery with the Free Church of Scotland. [Hear, hear.] The Free Church are thus the argument with the old Presbyterian Assembly for no action in regard to slavery, and for keeping rivetted upon him the bonds of the slave. He should not deem it right to close without a few words in regard to the Evangelical Alliance, which, under that name, had lately been formed in London. He was not a member of that Alliance. He had desired farther light in regard to it—to learn what was duty. From the exclusion of the press from its meetings, the public was not as yet well aware of its proceedings. He had seen the decisions of that Alliance in regard to slavery and communion with those who are slaveholders, as these appeared in the daily papers, and he had come to the conclusion that they would certainly damage the cause of anti-slavery, both on this side and on the other side of the Atlantic. [Hear, hear.] He had learned, however, from brethren—members of that Alliance—that the action of the Alliance had not been fairly, any more than fully, given to the public. He felt himself bound, in duty to these brethren, to wait the publication of the authentic accounts of the Alliance before he should pronounce upon its position towards slavery. These brethren were in connection with a Church which had declared its unwillingness to hold fellowship with any of the Churches in America who sanctioned slavery in that country, and he was sure they were no friends to slavery. He should, in justice to the Alliance itself, suspend his judgment till he had its own authoritative documents, from which to gather a fair and impartial decision. He concluded by proposing the adoption of the motion, which, after being seconded in a few words by Mr. E. Anderson, was unanimously agreed to.

The following resolution was also read by Mr. Jeffrey, and passed in respectful silence:—

"Resolved, That this meeting receives the intelligence of the death of the venerable THOMAS CLARKSON, the world-honoured pioneer in the cause of the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade, with profound emotion; and in his removal from this to 'another and a better world,' at a time when the Slave Power of America is attempting to corrupt the religious sentiment of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, in order to perpetuate its horrid existence, we would find additional incentives to imitate his glorious example, and consecrate our lives to the great cause for which he lived and laboured to the last."

Mr. Andrew Paton said, I have to move a resolution condemning the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance in relation to slavery. I judge of these proceedings from the resolutions officially issued, and regret the necessity which calls for my resolution. The Glasgow Emancipation Society, foreseeing the important influence which the decision of this Alliance as to slaveholders would have on the anti-slavery cause, did, *in November last*, issue a long and faithful letter, addressed to the Evangelical Alliance, pointing out what they conceived to be the duty of the Alliance, and the advancement which our cause would receive by the exclusion, and the injury it would sustain by the admission of slaveholders to their membership,—2000 of this letter, in pamphlet form, were printed and put into the hands of, I believe, almost every member of the Alliance. This body, consisting of about 1000 persons, chiefly clergymen, came together from various countries, professedly to expound to the world the essentials of Christianity. Their course, from first to last, on slavery, has been tortuous, jesuitical, and unbecoming such a convocation, if wishing to act only a single-minded, straightforward part—first, slaveholders were not declared excluded, but only "not to be invited to membership;"—next, "slaveholders might be admitted if they were the *elité* of slaveholders, or, as the resolution designates them, "slaveholders who are so, not through their own fault, nor retaining their fellow-men in bondage from a regard to their own interest;"—finally, as neither of these ingenious modes of admitting slaveholders through a door only partially opened, would satisfy their American members, who insisted that the slaveholders should walk in with them through doors thrown wide open, the Alliance formally rescinded their resolutions, and blotted from their records all mention of any opinion expressed or action taken on slavery or slaveholders. This conduct their Chairman, Sir C. E. Smith, declared would "stultify" them; but from it he had not the manliness to dissent; and to it all the members assented, except some five honest men. [Shame.] Almost their first act was to declare that, with Quakers, Plymouth brethren, &c. they could not associate; one of their last acts was, to admit slaveholders. [Shame.] Before them stood the slave, manacled, deprived of all knowledge of the Holy Bible; and the slaveholder, haughty and unrelenting; the oppressed and his oppressor. Which of these two would Jesus Christ have invited to his fellowship with words of kindness; and which would Christ have repelled, however loud he proclaimed, "Lord, Lord, have I not prophesied in thy name," until at least he had shown the first fruits of his repentance, by quitting his unrighteous grasp of his brother? Which did the Alliance, claiming Christ as their guide and pattern, and after prayer to him for light, admit? Alas! passing by the poor slave without recognition, they took the hand of the manstealer, and his hypocritical apologists, in acknowledgment of their being eminent and exemplary Christians. This conduct has truly stultified the Evangelical Alliance; its moral power is gone—this hideous moral plague-spot covers its entire countenance; true-hearted men every where turn from it with pity and disgust. [Applause.] Some of its members were from this city. Most of them, I believe, had left London before the final decision was come to. From the condemnation of the Alliance we do not for one moment refrain; but, in the meantime, we shall suspend our judgment on these men, and allow them still a short space to come forward to disclaim and denounce the decision of the Alliance—assuring them that, unless this is done speedily and heartily, they shall have the full weight of our condemnation, be their standing in the religious world what it may—be they the clergymen under whom many of us sit, they shall find, that to every apologist for slaveholders we are opposed; that all sophistry, come whence it may, attempting to cover slaveholders with the robes of Christianity, we shall unmask—they must choose their place and companionship with the slave, or the slaveholder, with the oppressed, or his oppressor. [Applause.] I hope that the members of the Alliance resident here, will early call a public meeting to give an account of its proceedings, as has already been done in some English towns; and that they will distinctly, and in plain words, inform their townsmen, if they approve of slaveholders being members of the Alliance, and if they are ready to sit side by side with manstealers, taking counsel with them for advancing the kingdom

of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who commands to "do to others as ye would that they should do unto you," and "to break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free." [Cheers.] My friends, be on your guard; I fear we shall find apologies for slaveholding—for manstealers—from lips, from pens, from which such could not have been expected. Let our souls be nerved for the coming conflict, and let all know that we shall not move from our immoveable position, of "No fellowship with slaveholders." [Great applause.]

Mr. John B. Ross seconded the resolution—

"Whereas the Evangelical Alliance, recently held in the City of London, composed of delegates from various parts of Christendom, professing to have formed that body "pre-eminently to please the Lord Jesus Christ," refused, at the bidding of the delegates from America, to testify against the enslavement of Three Millions of their fellow-men in that country, after their mournful and heathenish case was brought before them,—Therefore, resolved, that the burning rebuke, and emphatic condemnation of the Christian world ought to fall on the so called 'Evangelical Alliance,' as a body who proved treacherous to the cause of bleeding humanity; and, consequently, recreant to every principle of the religion of our compassionate Redeemer."

A vote of thanks to Bailie Turner for his conduct in the chair, having been given by acclamation, the meeting separated.

PUBLIC BREAKFAST

IN HONOUR OF

Messrs. Garrison and Douglass.

A Public Breakfast was given to the above gentlemen on Friday morning the 2d instant, in the Eagle Temperance Hotel, Maxwell Street. The company was highly respectable, and among them a number of ladies.

Councillor Smith occupied the chair, and after breakfast, introduced Mr. Garrison, who, at considerable length, gave a detail of the difficulties he and his fellow-labourers had encountered since first commencing the Anti-Slavery movement in America. They had been engaged, he said, in a six or seven years' moral warfare in settling the question of *immediate* as opposed to *gradual* emancipation. Thank God, that question is settled now; there is no more talk of gradual emancipation among the true friends of the slave. Another of the outposts they encountered was the Colonization Society—a body, he had no hesitation in saying, unparalleled in the cold-blooded nature of their atrocious designs. They professed to be *friends* of the slave; and how did they propose to befriend him, think you? Why, by sending him out of the country—[laughter];—by passing a sentence of banishment on him! Strange inconsistency. These men had unceasingly characterized the free coloured population as the scum of society; and yet they proposed to send these very men as agents for civilizing and Christianizing their heathen brethren in Africa! It was a widespread delusion. All classes were entrapped by the specious plea for a time; even the Society of Friends were induced to lend it their support—[hear, hear];—but after a long struggle they had succeeded in unmasking its hollowness. That Society existed yet *in name*, but nothing more; and in corroboration of the estimate formed of it, he might state the simple fact, that of all the slaveholders originally composing it, not one, from the day of its institution until now, has ever emancipated a single slave! But these and other minor matters were but the outposts of this wicked system. They had conquered these; and fondly hoped that they were now engaged in an attack upon the citadel itself,—he referred to the American Union. They (the abolitionists) had disfranchised themselves for conscience' sake. They could not swear allegiance to a Government which required of them in return, that they should hunt or deliver up the runaway slave—that they should "keep watch and ward" on the unholy *property* of the blood-stained South. And, strong in the strength of moral right, they were calling upon all right-hearted men in the States to go with them for its dissolution. Their motto was, and he hoped it was that of their Glasgow friends,—"No Union with Slaveholders." [Cheers.]

The Rev. Mr. Rose (a gentleman of colour) here put a question to Mr. Garrison. He had heard it repeatedly said that the slaves were happy, and at this moment a gentleman of his own colour, the Rev. Mr. Clark, was going through the country, and declaring that his congregation, consisting of 600 or 700 slaves, were very happy and contented. Now, he would like to know if, in any of the slave states, the slaves had ever held meetings, at which they had passed resolutions to that effect; or if they had a newspaper, a periodical, or even a four-page tract, *proceeding from themselves*, which declared so?

Mr. Garrison.—I am not aware of any. [Laughter.]

Mr. W. S. Brown begged to make a suggestion. He said such meetings as the present are very pleasurable, and no doubt do a great deal of good; but before they separated, he should like to see something distinctly *practical* done. The most of them were aware that their honoured guest, William Lloyd Garrison, is the editor and proprietor of a newspaper published in Boston under the title of *The Liberator*. Now he thought they might do a little to increase the circulation of this paper. He had read it for some considerable time past, and could heartily recommend it as decidedly the most anti-slavery, straightforward, liberal, and in every respect talented paper he knew. In one of its features it is unique. It publishes *both* sides of the question. Several columns are devoted in every number, under the ominous title of "The Refuge of Oppression," to the opinions of the opposite party—opinions, too, which are not always couched in the most complimentary language towards its noble editor. How different, in this respect, from our own *Guardian*, (no, I will not say our own: I blush to think it is published in Scotland,) which, while it sneakingly inflicts a venomous stab, absolutely refuses to allow of any defence in its columns! *The Liberator* is a weekly paper, and owing to the cheap rate at which newspapers are published in America, may be had here, *postage included*, as cheaply as any of our local papers.

Mr. William Caird had much pleasure in seconding the suggestion; and proposed that their Secretary, Mr. Smeal, should take down names on the spot. A number of subscribers to the *Liberator* were then given in.

The Rev. James Robertson, of Edinburgh, Secretary of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society, said he was sorry that he could not say of the old Edinburgh Society what had that morning been said of the Glasgow Society—that it had stood fast to its colours. They had been obliged to form a new Society; in a great measure, if not wholly, owing to the dispute with the Free Church. He then animadverted, in strong terms, upon the conduct of that body in creating a pro-slavery sentiment amongst their members. Highlandmen, he said, might now actually be seen hunting up passages out of their Bibles in defence of slavery—thus imitating their leaders. He would advise the people of Scotland, if they wished to prevent these abominable sophistries from gaining ground, not to wait for their ministers taking up the question, or even to wait for great men coming; but in public meetings, in workshops, and by the wayside, to agitate this great question. [Cheers.] The very theory of liberty was in danger of being subverted by the sentiments propagated by such men as Drs. Cunningham and Candlish.

Mr. Garrison wished to make a single remark on the allusion to the *Liberator*. He had not expected such a proposal; but it gave him not less pleasure. He must warn them, however, that the *Liberator* was not the accredited organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It was his *own* paper; it was a free paper; and discussed other projects of reform as well as freedom to the slave, although that constituted the bulk of its matter. He was always happy at any time to let an opponent have *two* columns for his *one*, if he wished it. [Hear, hear.]

The Rev. George Jeffrey said he should not detain the meeting. He knew that the hour of business in the city had arrived, and he therefore felt it needful to be brief. The meeting had learned from Mr. Garrison not a few facts concerning the progress of the Anti-Slavery cause in the United States, and one thing especially, which he called upon them to notice. The question, Mr. Garrison had told them, no longer needed to be argued there on the ground of principle. The matter of principle was a settled matter in the Northern States of the Union. He was afraid that, while true of the Northern States, it was not true of Scot-

land. He feared that the battle had to be fought over again on the ground of principle. He should beg of them to remember that this country had listened to sentiments within two or three years past which would not have been tolerated during the agitation that immediately preceded our own Colonial Emancipation Act. Circumstances had arisen which had led to and easily explained the retrograde movement. These did not require to be stated—they were well known to all. Yet it was in these days, in this country, and after no little light, even now a matter of debate in some quarters, if slaveholding was a sin—and there were nice distinctions to be had, ready made, and beautiful suppositions which some thought were all needed to help us to the principle on this question. Years ago the principle of the question had been settled, and yet back again the question of principle had come, and just with the old appendages. The Glasgow Emancipation Society must be faithful to the principle it had already fought for. The fundamental principle of the Society had won for itself the public opinion of Scotland before, and it would do it again. What was the principle of the Society—what its bond and union? That slaveholding in all circumstances is a sin, and the slaveholder a sinner. The Society must not be decoyed from its principle, by suppositions that hang on the outskirts of the question—that have nothing to do with its heart, and little to do with the practical application of thr principle. The ground the Society occupied was easily understood, and the friends to the principle easily known by a straightforward answer to the question,—Do you hold slaveholding, in all circumstances, a sin not to be palliated by nice suppositions. He should be pained, if any of the movements of the day should cause the suspicion to be strengthened, that a struggle must take place on the ground of principle involved in the anti-slavery cause. [Hear.] He had already stated in another meeting, that he should not at present pronounce on the action of the Evangelical Alliance, in regard to American slaveholders and slaveholding ministers. [Hear.] He should wait until the documents were published by authority of that body. He had learned that morning with delight, that Dr. Wardlaw, the evening before, had read a letter to his congregation in reference to the action of the Alliance on the subject of slavery, which was not unlike the speech he had made in the Alliance; and it might be said of that speech, as reported in the daily papers, that it was worthy of the man and suited to the scene, and quite a speech for the Glasgow Emancipation Society. He could not believe that Dr. Wardlaw, or his own brethren in this city, would continue to sanction measures which damaged the Anti-slavery cause. Nay, he thought he might go farther and say, that even though the resolutions, as laid and passed, did not to their minds in any shape sanction slavery or encourage the slaveholder in his sin, or the churches and ministers on the other side of the Atlantic in their apathy and criminal carelessness about the condition of the slave, were it found that those resolutions had that tendency—that such was construed from them—that these did, as many thought, damage the anti-slavery cause, he believed, assuredly, that his brethren would repudiate them. The Rev. gentleman concluded with some general remarks in reference to the emancipation cause, which our space, however, does not admit of our giving.

Rev. G. S. Ingram, on rising, said—Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling to detain the meeting longer, yet I am desirous to say a few words before separating. Allusion has already been made to the party with whom we shall have to fight the battle of emancipation in this country, viz the Free Church. But there is another party also who oppose us by their connivance at the conduct of the Free Church respecting slavery, I mean the leading men in other denominations. The one to which I belong—the Congregational—is practically opposed to fellowship with slaveholders; but then nearly the whole of our ministers are unwilling to speak out against the proceedings of the Free Church. At the annual meeting of the Congregational Union, held in April of last year in this city, I submitted a resolution condemnatory of the conduct of the pro-slavery churches in America, and embodied in it a condemnation of the Free Church for having received the slaveholder and his dollars; but because allusion was made to the Free Church, I could not get a man in that large meeting to rise and second my motion! [Cries of "Shame, shame."] Yes, Sir, it *is* shameful that the Congregationalists should unanimously remonstrate with a pro-slavery Church in America, and not do the same with a pro-slavery Church in Britain, for such the Free Church is. I trust they will yet see their duty in this matter. Well, but what apology do the callous in all denominations offer? Why, Sir, their apology is offered in the shape of advice to us fiery sparks. They say, You take extreme views on slavery. Be more moderate in your opinions about it. Why, Sir, I confess I am unable to see how it is possible for a man to hold extreme or ultra views of this question. There is but one point, and short of it we *dare not* go, and beyond it we *cannot* go, if we are to be faithful to human liberty and scriptural principle; and that point is, the immediate, complete, and permanent emancipation of every slave, and no Christian fellowship with slaveholders. This is all we contend for, and less than this we shall never take. These good, peaceable advisers tell us next, to cease from using such strong language as we do. No man, Sir, is more hostile to the use of harsh, scurrilous language than I am. It is beneath the dignity of an advocate of truth and freedom to have recourse to such a contemptible weapon. But I like to call things by their right names. It is treachery to God and to humanity to address sin in gentle and honied words;—to cover its heinousness, and to extenuate the guilt of its wilful perpetrators. Look at the volume of inspiration, and read the burning denunciations of its Prophets and Apostles; and, above all, the terrible and blasting rebukes of their divine Master to the oppressors of the stranger, the widow, and the fatherless. No vocabulary can furnish stronger terms than those employed against oppressors by Him who spake as never man spake. We shall ever be safe if we follow him, let men say of us what they choose. But our quiet counsellors advise us further to show less excitement, to be calm in carrying on our work. Sir, I wonder if these cool friends would tell us to be calm, were *their* children stolen from them and sold to be slaves, and their price put into the coffers, and their enslavers welcomed into the fellowship of the Free Church? [Cheers.] Would yon father, whose daughter has been stolen and degraded, tell me, in pleading for her liberty and demanding her immediate restoration to virtue—would he then counsel me to be calm? If he did, would not the world brand him as a monster, and deny him to have the feelings of a man? Be calm! Why, Sir, were we pleading for three millions of tiny insects that sport their short existence in the sunbeam, then we might be calm. Were we contending for the safety of three millions of pearls that may stud the coronet of a sovereign, then we might be calm. But when we are struggling for the freedom of three millions of rational, and feeling, and immortal beings, enslaved, polluted, oppressed, tortured, murdered, how can—how *dare* we be calm? If, Sir, the leading ministers in Scotland, not connected with the Free Church, shall stand aloof from us in this coming struggle, let us not on that account be disheartened. God chooses "the weak things of this world to confound the mighty." He is with us in our enterprise of mercy, and if the battle be keen and protracted, the more honourable will be the triumphs. [Cheers.]

After a vote of thanks to the Chairman, the meeting broke up. It is but justice to Mr. Graham, the landlord of the Eagle, to say that the viands were of the best description, and very tastefully served up.

Mr. GARRISON's ENGAGEMENTS.

We learn that Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, yielding to the solicitations of his friends, has consented to remain in this country until the sailing of the *Cambria*, on the 4th November. We have seen a list of the engagements of Mr. Garrison, who is to be accompanied by Mr. George Thompson, by which it appears that meetings on Slavery and the Evangelical Alliance are to be held in many of our principal towns between this date and the sailing of Mr. Garrison. At the meeting in Manchester, on Monday last, it is estimated 4000 persons were present; and we observe the days fixed for Edinburgh, are October 20th and 21st; Dundee 23d; Perth 24th; Aberdeen or Inverness 26th, and Glasgow the 28th.

Glasgow Argus Oct 15/46 116

DR. WILLIS'S OVERTURE ON SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW ARGUS.

SIR,—Having been favoured with admission to the Free Tron Church Session House on the 7th instant, when the Free Presbytery of Glasgow met there, and the Rev. Dr. Willis brought forward his "Overture on Slavery in America," of which a full report appears in the *Scottish Guardian* to-day, perhaps you will permit me to offer a few remarks on the proceedings, and the impressions which occurred.

I say "favoured with admission," for towards evening the house, which was but small, was very crowded, and many were clamorous for admission, and when it was suggested to the officials to have the Church opened for the public, it was refused.

It will not be wondered at that the public were clamorous for admission, when it is generally known that Dr. Willis has been for several years a member, and now a Vice-President, of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and has frequently distinguished himself at the public meetings of that body, by his faithful exposure and reproof of the Free Church, or rather its leaders, in reference to the position in which they have placed that Church in regard to the American slaveholders and their money; and also that his motion, which then came on, was postponed for a month past, to suit one of the members of Presbytery; and when it is further known that the Rev. James Macbeth, who supported Dr. Willis in this motion, was the gentleman who, unaided and unsupported—to the shame of the Assembly be it said—brought forward a similar motion in the last General Assembly of that Church, but which motion had not even a seconder!

The general purport of Dr. Willis's motion was somewhat anticipated, for it was understood that he was not satisfied with the decision of the last Assembly, having been on a mission to Canada when it was held. But having, from the experience of several years, a tolerably good knowledge of the materials of which this Presbytery generally, since their Established Church days, are composed, we were not very sanguine of his success, especially in an argument founded on a philological discussion; for if a back-door can be got to escape by, they will be out, from opposing or offending their friends the money-giving slaveholders.

Were there in Scripture any precise or positive terms for the exclusion of slaveholders or manstealers from Church fellowship, were they placed in the same category with all thieves and those who walk disorderly and had they an edict from the Apostle Paul's own hand, that all such were to be excluded, then they might have no way of escape, and might be brought to the same judgment in the matter with Reformed Presbyterians and Quakers. But now, since it suits their purpose, and the purpose of their leaders, these characters must have every indulgence.

They almost all, one after another, tell the public that they are great haters of slavery—they have got so far now as even to admit that it is "*slavery in the abstract;*" but they forget that the public have but little faith in their confessions, and look for proof in these days of profession.

Mr. Gibson, who, if we mistake not, wrote the preface to Bourne's Picture of Slavery ten years ago, or, at any rate, had a hand in the matter, says, "Let it not be alleged, because we cannot see our way to the extreme principles and practical conclusions of our friends, that we are the apologists of slavery. I feel it a degradation to make such caveats. I felt it my duty to denounce the abominable atrocities of American slavery many years ago, and to take my own way of exposing them." He will perhaps remember who says, at page 91 of that book, reprinted and abridged at the University Press, Glasgow, for W. R. M'Phun, 86, Trongate,—"How can this desolating curse effectually be extirpated?

"*Every slaveholder, peremptorily, and without delay, must be excommunicated from the Church of God.*

"It is of no importance what titles, what office, what station, or what rank the slaveholder may hold, or what apparent virtues or talents he may possess and develop. To all these specious pleas, and to all his anti-Christian white-washing, there is a concise, significant, and irrefutable reply—*He is a manstealer!* But as a manstealer is the very highest criminal in the judgment of God, and of all rational uncorrupted men, he cannot be a Christian; and, therefore, it is an insult to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, to record the most notorious criminal as an acceptable member of the household of faith."

But let any one read what this same Mr Gibson says now of excommunication. He was then, with the rest of the Established Church Ministers of Scotland, waging a hot war—a war of words—against the Voluntaries of Scotland, who were strongly opposed to Church Endowments, and to the entire principles of an Established Church; and they had discovered that many, if not most of the Voluntary Churches of America had slaveholders in connection with them, and this was resorted to, in their extremity, as a strong plea against Voluntaryism, as if the two were indissolubly connected; and it suited their purpose then to bring up this as an argument against Voluntaryism, but obviously not to forward the abolition of slavery, for neither before nor since have they been known in the abolition ranks; yet they—for they are the Free Churchmen of the present day—are all, of course, very much opposed to slavery!

But, strange to say, we find several of them in this discussion attributing the abolition of slavery to Infidels, or, which is the same thing, saying that Infidels are engaged in it. The old cry of the Free Churchmen when they were in the Established Church to their Voluntary brethren was, "Voluntaries and Infidels." Now they have invented a new one, Abolitionists and Infidels, to which some have added Sabbath-breakers, forgetting that such terms are no reproach now any more than when Christ was charged with "casting out devils by Beelzebub," or with being a Sabbath-breaker—an offence not known in the New Testament.

Mr. Arnot says, and says truly, that "the slaves need to be defended against an ungodly Legislature, and an unfaithful Church. They have no help in man."

But then follows Mr. Lorimer, who, in describing the "crusade," as he calls it, against the Free Church, gives vent to some bitter complainings against the reproach and vituperation poured out against the Free Church in connection with this matter; but he especially pounces first upon the Established Church, who have, he says, in Carolina a church and congregation partly of slaveholders, in existence for many

years, forming part of the Established Church of Scotland; but receiving a far larger proportion of slave-money than ever came from the slave states to the Free Church. His main object, however, seemed to be to disburden himself of the contents of a paragraph in the *Christian Witness*, which he flourished in his hand, and which he stated contained a "flagrant proof of the infidelity" of the "infidel and irreligious party" in "the crusade against that persecuted Free Church." He then read a resolution passed by a body of abolitionists in Broadway Tabernacle, New York, on 12th May last. But he seems not to know that these abolitionists take generally a more summary way of getting clear of the "unfaithful church," or churches spoken of by Mr. Arnot, for they will have no communion with them, and therefore they "rejoice in the decline of the religion" professed by such unfaithful churches, which from its prevalence is called in the resolution American Religion—a slave-holding or pro-slavery religion, somewhat akin to that of the Free Church—for it was a religion which "comes forth to baptise and sanctify slavery;" and, therefore, they are, we think, very properly infidels to such a religion.

Were some of the Free Church ministers whom we heard at the Presbytery on the 7th, in New York, or somewhat farther south, we fear that they would have to be reckoned in Mr. Arnot's unfaithful church—the infidels whom the Abolitionists will not join and whose decline they rejoice in. But we must bring our remarks to a close, observing that most of the speakers rejoiced that the Free Church could count the Anti-Slavery — we should rather say—pro-slavery views of the "Evangelical Alliance" on the side of the Free Church!! Yes, Mr. Arnot, the slaves will surely be the better of all the help they will get from the Free Church and the American members of the "Evangelical Alliance."—Yours, &c.

HOMO.

Glasgow Argus Oct 15. 1846

FREE PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW—OCTOBER 7.

OVERTURE ON SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

Dr. WILLIS rose to move the transmission of the following overture:—

"That the General Assembly take into serious consideration the relations of this Church with those Churches in America that avowedly provide, by their terms of communion, for the sufferance of slavery, as in the circumstances in which it exists in the American States constituting no bar to full ecclesiastical membership. And this is overtured on these grounds,—1. That the late decision was come to in the absence of an important document, since published, but which, if laid on the table of the House, might have affected and modified materially the sentiments of those who judged upon the question. 2. That, pending the use of those remonstrances which this Church is pledged to use with those Churches, still it is worthy of consideration whether the intercommunion which is in the meantime held, amounting as it does to a recognising of the general orderly constitution of the American Churches, be not so indefinite in its terms as respects its nature, the parties to whom it is to be extended, and the time during which it is to be prolonged, as to be likely to affect injuriously the tone of sentiment, both at home and abroad, as regards slavery itself, and great Bible principles interested and involved in the whole question."

Dr. WILLIS spoke in effect as follows:—Moderator,—It is under a deep impression of such an overture being called for that I bring it forward; and it is not less with a belief that it is seasonable in point of time. If I am right in considering that the recent decision of the General Assembly of this Church is liable to great exception, and that the casuistry which prevailed with the Assembly tends to work injuriously,—is already working injuriously, for the cause of the oppressed; can I too soon seek a reconsideration of that decision? I rejoice that it is not a final one—that the question remains open; and that it is understood that if those remonstrances with the American Churches, which are admitted to be necessary, shall not be effectual, then our ecclesiastical fellowship, or intercommunion with these Churches—call it by what name you may—a communion or intercourse recognising their scriptural and orderly constitution in the general—shall cease. This being the understanding, I might expect concurrence in my overture, even from such brethren here as are satisfied with the decision of the Assembly, but still as one not final. They may at least allow that it becomes Presbyteries to interest themselves in seeing that the business shall not be indefinitely postponed, nor allowed to drop. But, Sir, with the views which I cannot but take of the necessity of this Church assuming a different position from that now held by it in reference to the slavery cause, and of the danger either of our position being misunderstood, or, with some appearance of reason, being interpreted as resting on unsafe principles of communion, and bespeaking an inadequate estimate of the atrocities of the slave system,—I do earnestly invite a calm and dispassionate review of this business. I beg of my brethren to dismiss from their minds prejudices which may have been excited by the spirit and tone of discussions out of doors. Let me hope that the sentiment of every mind here is, that the cause of the slave shall not suffer with us, even by the hostility, as it might seem, to us and to other evangelical parties, manifested by some of the Abolitionists. I regret that individuals have been injuring, as it appears to me, not the cause of the slave, I hope, but at least their own power of doing it service, by mixing up with their pleadings opinions with which I can have no sympathy. But let not one evil be an excuse to us for doing another. Let us listen to what is truth, come from what quarter it may; nay, let us even be willing to ask—Is there not a cause? I think it is Serle who says, it is an evidence of love, indeed, when we can love even those who wrongly judge of us and condemn us, not, indeed, for their wrong judgment, but for their hatred (so far as we can think it sincere) of the evil things they impute to us. And it is the holy Brainerd who tells us that so had he learned by Divine grace to overcome his own spirit, that he would in matters of offence be willing to own his blameworthiness wherein he was really in fault, even to him who had wronged him a hundred times more, and who refused all acknowledgment even for his hundredfold wrong. This is a difficult lesson to learn, but it is well to hold up a good standard. Let us ask, then, spite of all, are we doing what we ought in this great interest? Is the line of argument that has been pursued of late of a kind to impress men with the conviction that we abhorred at a suitable rate the crime of the man-stealer? Sir, very grave questions have come up. Whoever is to blame for it—it is said the violent Abolitionists are to blame for occasioning the appearance of this—we seem industriously to palliate, as in certain circumstances excusable, what yet in the abstract we allow to be a horrid sin. Especially, I lament that the Bible has suffered injustice—that it has been forced into the service of a system to which its whole spirit and letter, I maintain, are repugnant. And I feel impelled, were it but for my concern that its sacred authority should not be perverted to cloak grevious wrong, to scrutinise a process of argument that tends to lay a needless stumbling-block in the way of the believer in Divine revelation. For surely, Sir, impregnable as is the evidence of our faith, we are to beware of giving advantage to the infidel, by resigning any of these arguments derived even from the inherent character of the Bible, in which its advocate justly glories. And I at least believe the Bible all the more firmly, and love it the more ardently, because of its opposition to slavery. Can it seem to me a light matter that its very texts should be quoted to justify any sufferance of this abomination? Sir, we have only to ask what slavery is,—and, oh, who can define it?—that complication of all crime—that God-defying outrage on all that is dear to man—that spoiler of all that is characteristic of man himself; which makes man a beast, a chattel, a saleable commodity—which disallows the prerogatives of his reason, and defies the sanctity of conscience—which knows itself so proscribed by Scripture, that it dreads nothing so much as the entrance of Scripture light into its dark domain, and legislates sternly for its exclusion;—who, Sir, does not feel that the idea of linking the cause of the slaveholder with the cause of Scripture is an idea the most preposterous; and that that interpretation of the

Bible must be wrong, let its plausibilities be what they may, which would adduce its sacred text to sanction, directly or indirectly, in any circumstances whatever, the thing called slavery? For, suppositions have been made, distinctions drawn, and pleas set up upon the ground of these, to establish the title of slaveholders, in certain circumstances, to ecclesiastical forbearance. My brief answer is, that these cases, real or hypothetical, are not slavery. But, Sir, if the interpretation of Scripture which I refer to be just, it will cover not the slave-haver only, but the slave-holder, and the most decided defenders of slave-holding, as well as the reluctant; for while it is indeed admitted that wherever there is slavery there is sin, it is yet contended that the Apostles do recognize the relation, however they forbid its abuses. In other words, the exhortations to servants and masters, because so large a proportion of servants were in those days slaves, must be understood to authenticate even the special characteristics of slavery itself; or the relations strictly and literally of slave and slave-owner are to be understood as recognised by the side of other mutual relations, resting indubitably on the law of nature and of God, as those of husband and wife, of parent and child, of ruler and subject. Now, Sir, I arraign this principle as utterly wrong; wrong in biblical interpretation; wrong, as contradictory to the very admission that slavery is in itself sinful, and an abomination. May we not see at once a presumption of a great error in the fact that this cannot be affirmed of the other relations of the social state, which are mentioned in the same catalogue, as inferring mutual duties and responsibilities? Can we say of these that they are sinful? Can we say of these, what is admitted at the least to be true of slavery, that the spirit of the Scripture condemns them, and that it was left to the progress of Christianity in its moral influence to extinguish them? Sir, my argument here is analogous with one whose great value is admitted in another department of Christian ethics. Is it not one of the proofs which no wise advocate of the moral obligation of the Sabbath omits to employ against such as would reduce the Sabbatical law to a mere ceremonial one—that the fourth commandment is found in the catalogue of moral and perpetual duties? We do not find it classed with merely temporary obligations, but enshrined in the Decalogue with the others whose perpetual obligation is unquestionable! So here, Moderator, it is not the relation of slave and slaveholder, but of master and servant — as our translators of the Scriptures most properly have judged — that is, recognised, along with those other relationships belonging to the essential conditions of social life. The thing slavery is essentially distinct — it has no foundation in God's eternal law; it is not recognised as the foundation of mutual moral obligations, except in so far as the slave under the yoke is encouraged to patience with this as with other evils from which it is permitted him to seek deliverance, and only to endure with meekness when inevitable; —or if more is enjoined, it is where the relation of slaveholder is presumed to be changed into master, and the reciprocal obligations of master and servant are contemplated with reference to the rule of "just and equal," a rule which supposes contract, and supposes the servant to be in a capacity to do service with good-will, and to recognise a Master in Heaven—not the mere will of man as his ultimate law. But that is irreconcilable with slavery. Here I am brought, and I am most willing to meet it, to the philological argument, or that founded on the fact of the Apostles having applied to masters and servants the names by common custom applied to slaves. The question here is not whether the term "*doulos*," in the frequent or current use of it among the Greeks, denoted a bond-servant—a slave; but whether the Apostles, in using that term, look more to the secondary or derivative use of it, in which it marks service only, without respect to its special kind, or its local and temporary characteristics. That it marks slavery by contrast with freedom, not in classic writing only, but sometimes in Scripture too, no one denies. My friend, Mr. M'Beth, was supposed to deny this. He does not. But it is just as undeniable that in classic writing it was used in its secondary as well as its rigid sense; and it is undeniable that the Septuagint translators of the Old Testament, and the sacred writers of the New, do with great frequency attach the term to persons doing service indeed, but in such circumstances that the idea of slavery is not only evidently separable from it, but absolutely irreconcileable with it. The same word, which it is held by some must signify slave, is that (let even the simplest English reader judge of the conclusion here) which the apostles apply to Paul, to John, to the angel who appeared to John, to Moses, and to Christ himself. It is applied to the service rendered under the dictate of filial duty to a kind and loving father—as in the case of the elder brother of the prodigal (Luke xv.) It is applied by our Lord to the faithful steward also. Now what we argue is this, that since the word had various applications, and we are especially concerned with its application by the sacred writers, we are under no necessity, to say the least, to attach to it what may be its rigid etymological, or even, among the heathen, most current meaning, when found in connection with rules of enduring application, destined to apply both at that time and in ages when slavery should be unknown. Then, we also reason, that the meaning cannot in such a case be determined by the philological question alone: the general rules laid down as to the duties of the party addressed, do forbid the idea that the special relations of slavery are authenticated, or that the obedience of the slave is enjoined any otherwise than as it could be rendered in harmony with the "just and equal" principles I have been referring to,—principles applicable to masters as well as servants, and destructive of slavery in its very essence. And again we are confirmed in refusing that the apostles recognised the characteristic relation of the slave under the term *doulos*, by finding that stealers of men are classed with murderers, &c. (1st Tim. 1.); and who are these stealers of men? The best interpreters include under this word such as rapaciously and wantonly have forced men into continued bondage, or encouraged such a traffic by purchasing (to hold as slaves or sell again) those whom they know to be thus unjustly acquired. I must do Dr. M'Knight the justice to say that he concurs in this interpretation of the word *andrapodistais*, however unsatisfactory may be his notes elsewhere. Sir, it has astonished me that the very inferences deducted by some of our friends from their sense of *doulos*, do not convince them that their premises are wrong. It were amusing, if it were not so serious a subject, to follow them in their analogies. I have seen it seriously set forth in sermons or tracts—I have heard it said at this Presbytery table, that the very force of the word is injured, even when it is applied to saints and to apostles, and of course to angels, and to Christ too, unless you still carry along the idea of literal slavery! Can anything be more monstrous? Paul, who exclaims, "Am I not free?" was then Christ's slave! Christians, Christ's "freemen"—distinctly so called —they "who have received not the spirit of bondage, but the spirit of adoption"—distinctly so characterised—are they indeed Christ's slaves, after all? Sir, it is a perfect contradiction of the true analogy. The very opposite is the truth. The analogy fails in every essential particular—it can agree in none but in those most general points of harmony in which you may see a saint has, in his relation to God, an analogy with the mere animal—nay, with the earth and the sun, as all being dependent on God—nay, in some respects earth may be said to hold of the sun itself, attached to it by an inevitable necessity. But what, I pray, are the essentials of slavery —its very characteristics? Test the analogy by these—the slave is bought, and so are we; but are we bought to be sold again?—are we not redeemed to be free? We are absolutely dependent on, and if saints indeed, absolutely devoted to, the will of our Master in heaven; but, Sir, is a perfect will—a will which to obey is our freedom, and which we shall, when obeying most absolutely, be most free. Is that what can be affirmed of the other term of the said analogy? Then, indeed, slavery were but name. No! till the will of man—capricious, and often merciless man—can be affirmed to be perfect, absolute subjection never can be due to him, nor can be righteously demanded. As little does the analogy hold, in the idea of absolute property claimed by man in his fellow-man. God has indeed right to us, and all ours, but so as that we are yet heirs of God, and have all things in Him. He permits us infinite acquisitions—he promises us glorious rewards. Christ's yoke is easy. He exacts no service to which he has not a righteous claim. He owns, so to speak, a contract with us. He seeks our consent. He rules by love. He enables to what he commands; and his requirements of duty to himself are in harmony with all that we owe in other relations; nay, instead of being violatory of these, secure our fidelity to every duty that arises from them. We are not slaves: we are servants—we are sons. It was necessary for me to destroy this absurd attempt to confirm an erroneous sense of the very words of sacred writ; but I must call attention to an-

other principle most essential to a right understanding of the ethics of the New Testament. Sir, it is not with reference to one of the social relations only that we have to distinguish between what was essential in those relations, as recognised by the apostles, and what was local or temporary having no foundation in the law of nature and of God. Take the political relation, for instance: will it be maintained by any man that the apostles, in recognising civil government, sanctioned the then existing despotism of Rome? Yet they inculcate subjection; they forbid resistance. But see to what you would be driven if you maintained that the law of Divine Revelation sanctioned passive obedience to that monstrous tyranny—that military despotism—for it was nothing else—which behoved to be broken up before the very first germ of civil and religious liberty were suffered to develope themselves in the world. Sir, respect to government is enjoined: it was a duty even then, and it is a duty always, to submit to principalities and powers as being of God, and, so far as answering the end of ordinances of God, for good. But did the precept bind to more? or if to more, was it to more than to patient suffering? just as the servant is counselled to be in subjection even to the "froward master" or "despot" in private life—not that the duty of obedience in either case has no bounds. Do I need to remind you, that the very charter of European liberty was deduced from such an interpretation of Scripture as I contend for? Need I recall to your minds the reasonings of a Milton against a Salmasius, or the grand principles of a true liberal jurisprudence asserted by a George Buchanan, and assented to by our soundest and best Reformers—to what effect? that the Scripture inculcations of obedience to tyrants, implied no recognition of the tyrants' authority; and that even kings are amenable to laws and to constitutions. But, Sir, I maintain that the theory which would allow the authority of a slaveholder—I do not say the abuses of the authority but the authority itself—the usurpation formed in violence, in rapacity, in fraud—as a legal relation in the sight of God, binding men to submit to it, even when able to take back by force, what force alone had taken from them; Sir, that theory would equally confirm every yoke, and would have perpetuated civil as well as domestic despotism. There is a missing in all such theories of a great principle, which I have seen to be overlooked in more than one controversy, but most necessary to be kept in mind. It is this, that Christianity did not create, but does pre-suppose certain rights of man as belonging to his very nature, and to the essential conditions of his social state. These Christianity recognises and confirms. They are as old as the moral law, the law of mutual love, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. Here, then, is the test of all mutual obligations—of all authority on one side, and obedience on the other. The specific apostolic rules for magistrates and subjects, are but announced in very general terms, it may be perceived. They suppose a law of love and righteousness already known; the gospel only brings new power to obey it, and new encouragements and motives. And so men are bidden to obey "the powers," but left in full possession of the right to model and choose their Governments; and servants are bidden to obey, but their right of contract, their right of being consenting parties, is reserved to them as existing by a prior law—and instead of being withdrawn by the gospel, is recognised in the very supposition of a capacity to do service "with good will." Then, Sir, we have the Old Testament to help us in the explication of that original law. In many of its applications to social life, I have no doubt it is intended we should consult the approved examples recorded there. And who can fail to see, that the spirit of that social and national policy which was given to Israel, was opposed to everything like the spirit, whether of Roman or American slavery? I have thus gone at length into great principles of Bible interpretation, instead of reasoning in minute detail as to every text in Scripture occasionally adduced, because I believe the whole spirit of the sacred volume to be opposed to slavery in its very essence, and any difficulty as to this or that passage must be adjusted to the only rules with which the Bible, taken as a whole, will harmonise. And thus I account, in spite of all occasional quibblings, for the deep sense of our countrymen, and of Evangelical religious bodies generally, against slavery in all its forms and degrees. The condemnation of it has been pronounced well by the "Reformed Presbyterians" of Scotland, when they say, in a lately issued document, that "the system of slavery, which consists in buying, holding, and selling any of our fellow-men, is essentially immoral: that even were the masters to treat the slaves with the greatest kindness in all respects, yet the very principle upon which they claim them as mere property, is positively unjust—being inconsistent with the natural rights of man—being contrary not only to the holy precepts, but to the benevolent spirit of Christianity—and being calculated to produce many grievous wrongs, which no efforts of legislation can wholly prevent, so long as the iniquitous principle itself is recognised in the civil constitution, and tolerated in actual practice." And now, Sir, the question comes, where a national constitution has legalised slavery in its very worst forms, is a Church permitted to acquiesce in it—to look on with indifference at a great sin and enormous wrong? But this is what those American Churches in question do. They do in effect abet slavery—they "do not encourage" its abuses—but do they declare it wrong in itself? No; they rather misquote the Word of God to excuse it; and they plead, on the weakest grounds imaginable, to be excused from systematically opposing it, even by moral means—I include under these faithful testimonies to the State. Then, as regards their connection with us—it is not very easy, indeed, to say to what that connection amounts: it is expressed in very ambiguous terms in the documents issued by the late Assembly. But there is one definition of it I see. It is represented as such a friendly intercommunion as our standards allow with sister Churches at home, or foreign Churches harmonizing with us in the main matters of our testimony as a Church (that deliverance of our standards, however, has regard only to Churches seriously acting up *to light*, in reformation); and I presume our relation to the American Churches to include occasional pulpit intercommunion and fellowship in the sacraments. Such is occasionally extended to other religious bodies. Now, I have no doubt there are pious individuals and clergymen in those Churches. I disclaim the thought of our anathematizing them, or unchristianizing them; but, whatever benefit they might be capable to render us, yet I object to the principle, in dealing with bodies at large, whose terms of internal fellowship are grossly unchristian on the whole, that we should incautiously mix ourselves up with their responsibilities. But that is what we do, as it appears to me, when because, as it is said, there may be cases of *slave-having* or slave-holding—I care not which word you take—not inferring, it is alleged, culpability in the parties immediately concerned—therefore, we may hold such intercommunion with these Churches, in general, as may imply our homologating and authenticating of their general internal discipline. That these hypothetical cases or actual exceptions are rare, we have moral certainty. Ask, Sir, how many of these poor people of colour who have sought refuge in Canada have migrated from the slave states with the good-will of their masters? or, ask what proportion are poor fugitives, who have taken law into their own hand, and in so doing have done rightly—have, I believe, just done what Christianity permits—in saying, "If thou mayest become free, use it rather." When the servant is bidden not to be careful, though it be his lot to be under wanton oppression, it is not that he is forbidden to change his calling, or that in any other sense than in the sense of a permissive will of Providence, slavery can really be denominated the calling of a human being at all; it is only on the supposition that he cannot be free that he is bidden be content; and those precepts are pointed, not against the desire to escape from slavery, but against the mistaken idea that Christianity relieves from authority, even defined authority, or destroys those mutual relations or dependencies recognised by nature's law itself. Sir, I have no sympathy with the feeling under which those Churches, as spiritual bodies, plead off from the duty in their ecclesiastical character to intermeddle with State affairs—that is, in plain language, do not feel themselves obliged, though the Church is a witness for truth, to remonstrate with their lawgivers on a great violation of the law of nature and the law of God. I regret to see this excuse so gently and indulgently construed by our Assembly as just the extreme of what is called Voluntaryism. The extreme!—that is a considerable thing surely—but in fact Voluntaries would disclaim the pretence to fasten on their principles the evasion of the duty belonging to men as men, and to Churches too, and recognised by Voluntaries as well as others, in every part of the world. Sir, it is a poor evasion—it is viewed, I see, by the public press in Canada—the *Witness* of Montreal and

the *Banner* of Toronto insist upon a very different and a juster explanation. Still, I deprecate all hostilities to those Churches. I have no regret that friendly (if faithful only) communications should go to them; but I feel that our present relations with them are liable to be misunderstood, to the injury of great interests. I shall regret if our Church shall not take a very decided position in reference to so tremendous an oppression as prevails in yonder Continent. I only wish we should be prompt to follow the example of others, in bringing the full force of an unequivocal condemnation of slavery, out and out, to bear upon those who are conniving at it. It is nothing to the purpose to say that our country was long in the transgression. So it was. But the light our nation obtained has not for so brief a time now been diffused as that we should invent excuses for those who seek to exclude it. It is long since it was known that for a slave to touch the shores of Britain was to be free. It is not so few years even since that peremptory and happy decision was passed which annulled slavery in our colonies—a decision helped on not a little by one whom this Church had the honour to number among its ministers—when under a happy impulse he made that memorable assault on the principles of gradual abolition. We have seen no evil arising from a righteous course, and we should say to the American Churches—Do your duty, preach the whole gospel, trust Providence for the consequences. They say it were virtually to abolish their ecclesiastical societies to deal with slavery as in itself a sin; but if it is indeed, as we believe that it is, a monstrous violation of Christ's law, and especially in those countries is maintained by the prohibition of Christ's primary command to search the Scriptures—then, though I hear no such result at all, let Churches go down that can only subsist by contradicting the design of a Church, and acquiescing in a violation of nature's law and Christ's ordinances. The Head of the Church can find other witnesses. He can raise other Churches. Dr. Willis, in conclusion, said that he had never reckoned the money question the whole or the half of this grand matter. Some had made it too much a catch; doubtless, it was not the value of these donations which induced the Free Church to retain them; but notwithstanding practical difficulties in the returning of the gift, he would be glad, for the truth's sake, so far as the contributions of known slaveholding congregations were concerned, that this were respectfully proffered.

Mr. Arnot and Mr. Lorimer opposed the overture.

Mr. Macbeth seconded Dr. Willis's motion. He trusted he would be enabled, by grace, to imitate the noble example Dr. Willis had given, of avoiding everything personal or offensive; and he rejoiced in the good temper and friendly spirit which prevailed on the other side. No one could feel more than he did, his own inability to do justice to the cause he wished to advocate; he was encouraged, however, by the statement of a celebrated modern historian, that "some questions are so clear that in discussing them the strength of a child is equal to that of a giant;" and by remembering that he was holding no wild, or strange, or very peculiar opinion. The principle, "No communion with slaveholders," was one affirmed by thousands of pious individuals in Scotland, by hundreds of Independent Churches, by the Reformed Presbyterian Church, well known as a grave and sober-minded body; it was advocated in the *Scottish Presbyterian Magazine* in Scotland, in the *Christian Witness* in England, and in numerous other periodicals; and proclaimed by the Secession and by the Relief Churches. The Free Church stood in an isolated position in Scotland in refusing to affirm that for which Dr. Willis argued; and in such circumstances it was mere clap-trap to characterse this movement as "an American agitation." Many attempts had been made to excite a feeling against it by that appellation;—he was sure no such attempt would be made here to-night. The question was an important one; as to which the free Church stood alone among the free ecclesiastical communities in Scotland. That the opinion was not a novelty, that no slaveholder should be permitted to enter one of our pulpits, or to sit at one of our communion tables, the following quotation would show, from "Sketches of Ecclesiastical History," being the historical part of the Testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States:—"In the year 1809, Mr. M'Leod (the late Dr. A. M'Leod of New York, some of whose writings are so well known in this country) had received a call to the congregation of Wallkell, and among the subscribers there were holders of slaves. He urged this fact as a motive for rejecting the call. The Presbytery now having the subject regularly before them, resolved to purge the Church of this dreadful evil. They enacted that no slaveholder should be retained in their communion. . . . No slaveholder is since admitted to their communion." But, for anything our Assembly had done, we might hear of a slaveholder, or minister of a church crowded with slaveholders, officiating in one of our Free Church pulpits to-morrow. One principle he held on this subject was, that to strip a fellowman of his freedom was, in all circumstances, in the absence of an express divine warrant, such as existed under the Theocracy, from the great Owner of Man, unwarrantable, and a great crime. To illustrate this by a supposed case—Could any circumstance justify an individual despoiling of liberty a child of Dr. Duff's? It was alleged, in defence of the African slave-trade, that it was justifiable in some cases, as thus persons growing up in heathenism might be brought within the reach of the gospel; but no one here would set his face to such pleas—which just amounted to a defence of the doing evil that good may come. But if, in all cases, without exception, the first enslaving was a great sin, this involved as strong a condemnation of every after act of enslaving. He maintained that to retain in bonds was as indefensible as to bring into bonds. To show that this was no novel or extravagant tenet, he would read another quotation, from a sermon by Dr. M'Leod of New York, published and assented to by Dr. Symington of Paisley:—"Objection vi. I abhor the principle. The practice of importing and selling men is detestable. But here they are. We found them slaves. We are not obliged, at the expense of our property, to set them at liberty; the community in general will not consent to it. They will therefore be slaves. I want a servant. I may purchase and hold a slave. His condition will not be rendered worse by serving me; I am about to treat him mercifully; but, as matters are now situated, there can be no evil in my keeping him in bondage." These pleas (said Mr. Macbeth) include, in substance, the supposed extreme cases which those on the other side take shelter in. "The community will not consent to it. If we were to set them free, they would be sold again by the State. They will therefore be slaves. His condition will not be rendered worse by serving me; I will treat him mercifully," &c. Now hear how Dr. M'Leod—not a light-headed person—treated such suppositions and plea:—"Answer. If men were not strangely influenced by interested motives, they could not impose so far on their own understandings as to give indulgence to the principle contained in this objection. A long continuance of evil-doing will change the nature of wrong into right! If so, there is an end to the distinction between virtue and vice. Your fathers left the negroes in bondage, as an inheritance to you. Does this justify you in retaining them? No; if the first stealer and the first buyer acted contrary to justice, the constant retainer cannot be guiltless. You condemn the principle, but justify the practice. Act consistently, I beseech you. Touch not, taste not, handle not the unclean thing. Let me call your attention to another fact. You have a slave of thirty years of age in your possession. He was born in your house. By natural laws, and according to the first principles of civil liberty, he was born equally free with your son. Who has upon him committed the robbery by which he has been deprived of his natural rights?—Yourself. Lay not the blame on your parents, for you imitate their example. The text applies to you directly. You have stolen from his connections, from himself, a man born in your house. Have you purchased him? You have countenanced an impious commerce; the best reparation you can make is, to set your slave at liberty." After reading a similar quotation from Dr. Andrew Thomson, Mr. M. argued that he needed no more extreme doctrine than these great writers affirmed. To retain a slave, whether you considered him so or not—to retain him actually a slave, was in all cases a deed of flagrant criminality. But if that be admitted, discipline is called for, whensoever a slaveholder appears before you. No church, admitting freely slaveholders into her bosom, is to be treated as a church walking orderly; and if you do sit down and write a letter—a grave ecclesiastical document—to such a Church you must make it faithful—not unfaithful; and faithful it cannot be, unless you put this in it—that till they expel the slaveholder from their communion, you can receive no deputation from them, and must deem them far astray. To meet this, those on the other side seek an express divine warrant in the New Testament, or what will amount to that. He thought this poor work for a Free Church minister. But no such authorisation can be found

sanctioning the relation of slaveholder as under the present dispensation. The only two passages in which the master is addressed are Eph. vi. 9, where the expression, "the same things," points to the good things mentioned in verse 8, and to retain in bonds was not a good thing, he humbly thought; and Colos. iv. 1, a triumphant passage for Christianity: for it was by more than implication, a command which branded all slaveholding or slave-having. To retain in bonds was not giving to a servant that which was "just and equal." What man among us would think so, if he were the enslaved? Mr. Arnot's arguments astonished him. Christ a slaveholder! The believer a slave to Christ! Why, it was expressly stated—"He that is called, is the Lord's free man." He bought his people with a price; but bought to what? To slavery? No; but from slavery, in which he found them, and broke their fetters. The Lord's name was not "The Enslaver," but "the Redeemer." What a bad cause, when one so able and pious as his dear brother, Mr. Arnot, used such an argument! No sanction for this deed under this dispensation! It was an accursed deed, in every instance. The unhappy search for a New Testament warrant, or palliation, to cover the slaveholder's position, utterly fails. The great principle of interpretation affirmed by Dr. Willis, he thought invaluable; that the apostles looking at servitude, caught that in it which was to be for all time, and that they set forth by the term *doulos*, and for that they legislated; the very principle they acted on as to civil power, in Rom. xiii.; but they legislated as little for slavery in the servant's relation, as they did for despotism in the subject's relation. Another matter on which he was anxious to say a word, was the deliverance of our sister Church in Ireland in June last; the more so, as it had repeatedly been said, that that Church had decided just as the Free Church had done. It was not so. They went on the principle that all slaveholding is man-stealing—a principle which covered his whole position. To give an extract or two: "The Rev. Dr. Stewart then read the address, which was couched in the strongest language, declaring that the Committee abhorred slavery, and would neither spare the slaveholder or the apologist for slavery, as they viewed both in the light of persons who were wholly unfit to be members of the Church of Christ. They would show them that such characters had no right to be members of the Church of Christ." "The Rev. S. M. Dill said, . . . Who was a man-stealer? and what constituted that enormous sin? His answer to that question was, that the man who stole a man from himself, and claimed him as his property, was a man-stealer. It was not necessary that a man should be stolen from another—every man was his own owner, and whoever took a man from himself had stolen him; and, therefore, every man who had slaves in his possession was a man-stealer, for he kept stolen property." The same view is embodied in their letter itself, which affirmed a truth our Free Church letter carefully excludes. Mr. Arnot had referred to the Evangelical Alliance; and it was thus forced upon him to meet that. He would make no attack on the Alliance. It was endeavouring after a noble and needful object. But some blunders had been committed; so that in the eyes of many it needed itself a certificate, and could not give one. He thought our brethren who had gone there had, with the best intentions, fallen into three errors. An Alliance was more than a truce—their position was inconsistent if they embraced in an Alliance persons between whom and them there was no truce. He had seen the other day a group coming on board the Inverary steam-boat, which showed that war and persecution were waged on the Free Church by the Establishment and its members. That group consisted of a poor teacher, his wife, and four young children, driven from house and home. No alliance with any man, till at the very least he has publicly protested against such ruthless persecution, if carried on by his own Church! The not demanding such a protest from the Establishment people there, was one blunder. A second was, leaving the glorious doctrine of Christ's Headship out of the basis of union. He thought that very unfaithful. That was the very doctrine England especially needed. They could think it a good enough watch-word for Scotland, but not fit for the south. Their conduct reminded him of the old story of the London lady, who being in Scotland on a fine moonlight night, and being asked if it was not beautiful, turned up her nose, and said, "O, 'tis very well for a Scotch moon!" Is the Headship only good enough for a Scotch watch-word? A third false step, as hundreds thought, was, their thus laying a soft pillow under the heads of the Evangelical party in the English Church: that Church so Erastian—a party containing men eminent for piety, eminent for ability, and very eminent for timidity. High time for a good English disruption! He would not have referred to the Alliance had not Mr. Arnot and Mr. Lorimer forced it on him. A reference to it was no great argument—admirable as the aim of the Alliance was; nor did he say aught of any of its members, save those of his own Church." As to the money, that was quite subsidiary. He maintained no more than this, that there were cases where contributions could not decently be sought. Is it possible to deny it? Suppose at the terminus of a great railway, churches were built by the managers for evening sermons for their Sabbath-breaking selves and for their servants, forced to break the Sabbath, would you send a deputation there to collect money? You would not, especially if it were on the tacit understanding that nothing was to be said from the pulpit against Sabbath-breaking. He looked on the £3000 as the slaves' property, paid off his wages kept back by fraud, and would like to see the Church laying it out on the slave's behalf. But the great question, involving eternal truth, was that of communion: friendly intercourse by all means; but let it be that of honest, thorough, loving rebuke.

Dr. Buchanan—It is now rather late in the evening, and I am rather unwilling to detain the Presbytery, and yet I should like to say a few words before the discussion comes to a close. I regretted before it began that we should be called to enter on it, and that regret in no degree diminished as the discussion proceeded. I regret it on two grounds: In the first place, because this whole question—a grave, important, and intricate question—has been so recently and deliberately considered by the General Assembly; and, Sir, I will venture to say that that body contains men as zealous for the cause of the slave, and as jealous for the maintenance of all the principles of civil and religious liberty, for which men and Christians are called to contend, as any body that could be assembled within Christendom. And when we find that such a body, having had this question fully placed before it, and having thoroughly and deliberately considered it,—when we find that they came to an unanimous decision as to the course which it became the Church to follow in the matter, I think it would not have been a very great stretch, on the part of our friends who differ from that decision, to have allowed it to lie some time longer before the mind of the Church and of the country. But, Sir, the second reason on account of which I regret the introduction so soon of this difficult and intricate question into our Church courts, is the main one. In the second reason I do not refer so much to the risk to which we may be exposed, of having the reasons which we may be called to state for maintaining what we account to be a right and scriptural position in reference to this question treated as if they were apologies for slavery; Sir, I do not refer so much to the risk to which we may be exposed on that ground, because that is a mode of dealing with us and our arguments which is not likely to come from any quarter to which any respect is due. But what I do regret is the appearance of division among ourselves on a great and important question of religion and humanity. It has been over and over again said, and yet not too often or too strongly, that upon the great question of slavery there is not,—there cannot be,—a shadow of difference of opinion in this Presbytery, or throughout the bounds of the Free Church of Scotland. I most cordially concur in the sentiment expressed by my friend Mr. Arnot, that when Dr. Willis was declaiming so powerfully and eloquently against slavery, I really was tempted to forget that I had anything to reply to him—that we were engaged in a discussion which would necessitate such a reply. The only thing that did astonish me, when I came to think of it, was that such an address should be delivered in this Presbytery. If we had been the American Congress, and Dr. Willis the honourable Member for New York State, I should have thought his speech, although sometimes a little too loud for our small Presbytery House, neither too loud nor too eloquent to ring through the Capitol—I should have rejoiced to hear such sentiments, so well expressed, ringing in the ears of the American Legislature. But I did feel that to address such eloquent denunciations against slavery to us, as if we were in a position to need to be enlightened with such sentiments, was really, though not intentionally, to do us some wrong;—I mean, by the course of circumstances, to put us in a position of appearing to differ on a great question of religion and humanity, about which, I beg leave to say, we are en-

tirely and absolutely at one. I have, amongst my earliest recollections, none dearer in memory than that I sat at the feet of that eloquent man, Dr. Thomson, when he was flashing forth his lightnings against that accursed system. Sir, I, then a youth, could not take any share in the contest, but my heart went cordially with him; and I believe Dr. Thomson only represented feelings and sentiments which have an echo in every bosom within the Free Church of Scotland. Then, Sir, I take leave to say, however good and necessary the speech we have heard might have been in a certain assembly, it was not relevant to the question with which alone we, in this Church or Presbytery, at present have to do. What is the question with which this Presbytery or the Free Church of Scotland has to do? Dr. Duncan, in the discussion in the late Assembly, very properly made some distinctions on that subject. He said there were three questions which the subject might be said to involve. There was the question, what is the duty of a state under which slavery is established? Second, what is the duty of a Church living in a community where slavery is established by law? and, third, the question, what is the duty of another Church, away from these circumstances, towards that Church that is in these circumstances? And Dr. Duncan most justly and truly laid his finger on the last of these three questions, and called the attention of the House emphatically to this, that it was the last question alone with which the Free Church is now engaged. I apprehend this is the question now before us. And it appears to me, with all deference, and the most perfect and sincere respect to my friends Dr. Willis and Mr. Macbeth, that nine-tenths, or ninety-nine hundredths of what they so eloquently and well said, had really no bearing on that question at all. Now, Sir, that question,—What is our duty in reference to another church living in a community where slavery is established by laws? what is the right way of disposing of it? Dr. Willis and Mr. Macbeth think the right way of disposing of it is to determine to cut immediately all connection with the American Churches—I mean all connection in the way of friendly intercourse or communion—to stand entirely and altogether apart from them. That is their mode of disposing of that question; and the principle on which they arrive at that conclusion is this, that slaveholding in itself and *per se*, is in all circumstances not only sinful, but such a sin as to debar an individual in that position from church privileges. That is, as I understand, the ground on which they arrive at the conclusion, that we ought instantly to cut all friendly intercourse and communion with the American Churches. Now, I have heard all the arguments which they have this day advanced in support of that position, and have read with the utmost care what has been written in the course of this discussion on the subject. I read last night, in particular, the pamphlet of my friend Mr. Macbeth; I read it from end to end with great attention, and in many respects with great pleasure. I say I have read all the arguments which have been advanced in order to establish that slaveholding is not only sinful, *per se*, but a sin of such a character as to debar from Church privileges; and I remain entirely unconvinced. Dr. Willis, in opening this discussion, spoke very strongly against the conclusion on this matter at which the Assembly had arrived, on the alleged ground that the Assembly had been brought to that conclusion by the aid of casuistry, and he repeated that three or four times—I say, with great emphasis repeated it—as that which brought a just reflection against the Assembly. I, hearing so grave and serious a statement—for casuistry is always supposed and understood to imply some shade of something objectionable in the management to which it refers—I did listen with expectation and attention to hear on what grounds that charge was made: I listened to my friend Dr. Willis's speech with attention, but I did not hear so much as a sentence adduced by way of justifying that imputation; not a sentence or allusion to any grounds on which that charge was made. But I must take leave to say, that the conclusion as to the matter of slaveholding, *per se*, being a sin, and in all its circumstances, does not appear to be a conclusion only to be got at by a kind of reasoning, of which perhaps casuistical is the most appropriate designation. Sir, I was very much struck with my friend Mr. Macbeth's arguments on that subject. Of course, in order to make out this conclusion, it is indispensable that they make it clear and manifest that the apostles did not admit slaveholders to the communion of the Christian Church—I say it is indispensable that they make out that position. No doubt we had a great many negative statements as to its being impossible to show that any of the texts which are commonly adduced in reference to this point, really demonstrate that slaveholders were admitted to the communion of the primitive Church,—we had a great deal of that kind of reasoning advanced; but still it struck me, that throughout the arguments of Dr. Willis and Mr. Macbeth, there was a feeling, after all, of there being something untenable and unsatisfactory in this line of reasoning. [Dr. Willis—"No."] Why, Mr. Macbeth, in the course of his argument, referred with great confidence to a passage in Ephesians, and another in Colossians, and brought them forward as clear Scriptural commands for the manumission of slaves—he brought them forward as clear and undoubted declarations of the Spirit of God, written in his Word, that it is the bounden and imperative duty of every slave-master to manumit his slaves. Sir, I think it is very difficult to make out that idea as at all intended in the passages; but granting that Mr. Macbeth's argument was complete and conclusive, that these passages are really divine and authoritative commands to manumit slaves, where do we find this command? It is in the Epistle to the Ephesians, which begins, "To the saints and the faithful in Christ Jesus," If, therefore, receiving this command, they were receiving it as members of the Church of Christ, it might be a duty which they needed to be told of: but nevertheless that concedes the point, that notwithstanding of their being in this position, they were admissible into the communion of the Christian Church, and had been actually admitted. I think, Sir, the instance to which I have now referred is amply sufficient to vindicate the statement, that even in the act of attempting to make good the ground that slaveholders should not be admitted into the Christian Church, my friend felt it was a position which could not be faced, and therefore it was necessary to meet it in some other way. Another illustration to a similar effect in Mr. Macbeth's pamphlet struck me; he refers to Dr. Cunningham's argument in the Assembly on this very point, and says Dr. Cunningham deals in a great deal of confident and general assertion on the point, but is remarkably sparing in evidences. Dr. Cunningham, he says, does make a statement which, as far as it goes, Mr. Macbeth admits to be not destitute of probability, that, seeing in the existing state of society, in primitive times, slavery was universal, and seeing that the Christian Church was spreading itself in all quarters, there is, *ex facie*, a strong probability that there must have been slaveholders, as well as slaves, in the communion of the Christian Church. But, says Mr. Macbeth, one guess is as good as another, and his guess is this, that the apostles, finding a number of men upon whom slavery had come down from preceding generations, and who were ignorant of the true character of that system, and their duty in relation to it, —that the apostles, coming into contact with multitudes of men in these circumstances, had baptised them, but that the apostles, no doubt, overwhelmed these men with appeals and remonstrances; and till they got them to manumit their slaves, they would not admit them to the full privileges of the Church.

Mr. Macbeth—I do not countenance the guess; I merely said that persons opposed to Dr. Cunningham's opinion might make it.

Dr. Buchanan—I don't mean to say it was Mr. Macbeth's conjecture, for it would not stand with other parts of his argument; but I merely mean to say that in conducting the argument, our friends feel their position to be so difficult, and beset with so many improbabilities, that they are driven to some way of meeting these, by what they think opposite improbabilities. If the guess is not his own, Mr. Macbeth has been kind enough to put it forward for somebody else; but I must say it appears to me to be a very bad guess. I don't think there is anything in Scripture to sanction the notion that the apostles made any distinction between the title to baptism and the title to the Lord's Supper. I think it is an unsound doctrine, and every way unworthy of the tact and discrimination which, in conducting this argument, my friend ordinarily exhibits. And, apart from this general consideration, I must just come back on the plain letter of Scripture, where I find such passages as my friend Mr. Arnot referred to,—where I find in one clause "servants under the yoke" spoken of, and in the next "believing masters." Sir, I don't like to use the word "casuistical" in its offensive sense, but I am confident that the common sense of mankind will recoil from the conclusion, that these "believing masters" were not slaveholders, "masters" of

men "under the yoke" of slavery,—and the very fact of their being called "believing masters" is a proof of their having been members of the Church of Christ. The question then just comes back to this point,—if we cannot make out that the apostles excluded every man who was in possession of slaves from the communion of the Church,—if, on the contrary, there be grounds for the opposite conclusion, which seem to commend themselves to the common sense of every plain reader of Scripture, and grounds which have been accepted by the great body of Protestant and orthodox divines in their interpretation of the Word of God—if the case be in this position, that not only we cannot make out that the apostles excluded slaveholders, but that slaveholders were admitted into the communion of the Christian Church, are we warranted to say that *ipso facto* that should be a disqualification for admission into the Church of Christ which the apostles did not make a disqualification? and, above all, are we, when the question, to say the least of it, is involved in so much difficulty, are we, in such circumstances as these, to turn round on the American Churches and tell them that, unless they act on that principle, a principle which it costs even our friends on the other side so much straining to make out, shall we turn round on the American Churches and say that unless they adopt the views of Dr. Willis and Mr. Macbeth, we shall feel ourselves bound at once to cut all connection with them? I just feel with Mr. Arnot, that to whatever obloquy we may be subjected in refusing to be driven from what we believe to be a scriptural position, we must stand by it so long as we believe it to be a scriptural position. Dr. Willis in his speech made an eloquent statement of his determination not to be driven from what he considered to be his duty in this matter. I suppose we are all in the same condition; and all prepared to say that no obloquy, although ten times greater than it has been, will in the very least abate our zeal for the vindication of the liberty of the slave, or our denunciations against the atrocity of the system by which they are held in bondage. I think the general remarks which I have made dispose of the greater part of the argument of my two reverend friends. As I said before, the greater part of their argument was employed in establishing points on which we are entirely at one—was employed in demonstrating the iniquity of slavery, as to which we are entirely agreed. It was also employed for the purpose of demonstrating that the word of God gives no sanction to slavery;—in that also we are agreed. Dr. Thomson's honoured name has been brought forward, and quotations from some of his writings adduced, as if they really were against the position for which we are now contending. The sentiments of Dr. Thomson were directed exclusively to enforce the general principle that Scripture gives no countenance or sanction to slavery; but surely Mr. Macbeth could never mean that Dr. Thomson, when he used that language, intended to maintain that slave-holding, *per se*, disqualified from Church privileges. I believe that at that very moment there was a member of his own kirk-session who held slaves; and Dr. Thomson was himself a member of the Scottish Missionary Society, which employed agents in the West Indies who were in close connection with slavery and slave-owners. It is not, therefore, conceivable, that Dr. Thomson, who was a logician, and knew what he was doing, would employ an argument which would destroy himself. It is out of the question to assume that Dr. Thomson intended to set forth anything else than what we are prepared to set forth, that the Word of God gives no sanction to slavery. I would rather not,—at least I would hardly refer to the question of the money, to which allusion has been made by both of our friends. Mr. Macbeth put the case of railway proprietors setting a-going Sabbath trains, and building Churches, and our going to ask money from these Churches; putting this as a parallel case. Now, it appears to me that this is just a specimen of the kind of confusion that runs through a considerable part of my friend's speech and his pamphlet; inasmuch as he confounds the American Churches with the American State. Of course, if a parallel is to be made out, the railway proprietors represent the State, putting the system in force, and carrying it on. The Churches don't stand in that position—they don't ordain slavery—slavery is not an ecclesiastical institution; and, accordingly, there is no sort of parallelism between the two cases at all. The case put by Mr. Macbeth does not concern the Church but the State. But I do not mean to dwell on this. It was not much dwelt on by our friends, and it was not worth bestowing a great deal of trouble upon. But I would not wish to conclude without adding, that while I hold that the Free Church of Scotland is not only justified in taking up the ground which she occupies, but was bound to take it up, in the view both of Christian principle and Christian expediency, I at the same time am very far from justifying, or meaning to palliate, the conduct of the American Churches. Sir, I believe that the American Churches have had their tone upon this question miserably lowered by the circumstances in which they are placed. It is one of the evils of this accursed system, that it contaminates everything that touches it or is near it. Of course, I think that, in dealing with these Churches, we are bound to have some respect to the power of circumstances. It is a power we are all of us yielding to every day; and remembering that we are encompassed by infirmities, we should have some respect to it in the case of the Churches of America. But at the same time, while making this allowance, I cannot but regard as unworthy and unmanly the attitude they have borne towards American slavery. I think they have been accommodating themselves too much to their position. They have not taken up the bold and manly attitude which became the servants of Christ, who are sent into the world to be witnesses against the world's corruptions and errors. They have not borne such a testimony as they ought to have borne, and in not bearing it they have occasioned Christ's cause to be injured in the house of his friends. Still, Sir, that does not move me to the conclusion that we are called at this stage to cut off all friendly intercourse with the American Churches. We must remember the position in which the Churches of our own country stood in our own day. It is only fifteen years ago since there were slaveholders in every Christian Church within the British empire, and who can say we did all our duty then? and, therefore, I say it becomes us to speak with firmness no doubt, but still with humility, when we speak of the errors of others. Dr. Willis spoke of its being the boast of Britain that a slave no sooner touches our shores than the fetters fall from his limbs—and contrasted the freedom enjoyed in this country with the slavery of America—slavery under a constitution which declares all men to be born equal, and yet holds three millions of our fellow-creatures in the most cruel and abject bondage. He pointed to their position as exhibiting a striking contrast to that of Great Britain; but let us remember that if there is a gross inconsistency on the part of America in boasting of her freedom, and yet upholding a system of the most cruel oppression which the world ever saw, there was also much disgraceful inconsistency upon our part. Sir, at the very moment when Britain was boasting that no slave could touch her shores without becoming free, she was keeping tens of thousands of her own subjects in slavery, and sanctioning the horrible and fiendish traffic of the African slave trade. We ought to remember these things—they should keep us humble and modest, and teach us to remonstrate, no doubt, with our brethren in America, but to do it with the meekness of wisdom; and I believe if we do so, if we go on as we have begun, remonstrating, and waxing louder and louder in our remonstrances, if we do so, I believe we shall serve the cause of the slave, and the cause of God in these American churches far better than by the course which our friends would have us to take. And it is because I believe this to be the course of duty and the course of expediency that I am not prepared to transmit the overture of Dr. Willis, and that I am prepared to lay before the Presbytery a motion to reject it. It is this—

"That while this Presbytery regard slavery with abhorrence, as an accursed system, equally contrary to the spirit of God's Word, and to the natural rights of man,—and while they consider American slavery to be one of the most deplorable forms of the evil, unspeakably atrocious in itself, and highly aggravated by the fact, that it is maintained by a nation which boasts of its free institutions, and which has long enjoyed the blessed light of the gospel:—Yet, in respect that this whole subject was fully and deliberately considered in last Assembly, and the mind of this Church regarding it expressed in a unanimous decision,—and in respect that, by virtue of that decision, this Church is now in the attitude of remonstrating with the Churches in America as to their duty in this matter,—the Presbytery does not deem it suitable to take any additional step at present, and therefore decline to transmit the overture."

I move in these terms, that the overture of Dr. Willis be not transmitted.

Mr. Bremner, Mr. King, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Miller having each addressed the Presbytery,

Mr. Gibson said—I had intended to give a silent vote in support of Dr. Buchanan's amendment, but there is a point or two, not yet prominently brought out in the discussion, to which I would very shortly advert. I shall not attempt to enter on the general principles of the question, already so ably discussed by the preceding speakers. I entirely agree with them, that our friends Dr. Willis and Mr. Macbeth have altogether failed to make out their argument from Scripture. On the contrary, I think the Scripture argument, so far as it has applied to the points really before us, is considerably against them. There are two points requiring to be very clearly made out, before we can commit ourselves to the conclusions attempted to be forced upon us by the motion and speeches of our friends. First, That slavery, *per se*, and in all circumstances, is a sin—a crime so deep, that if any man be a slaveholder, no matter how, and no matter what his character and conduct may be in general, or towards these slaves, it demands his exclusion from the privileges of the Church of Christ; and then, second, when that is made out, that the Free Church is called upon to exercise discipline upon the American Churches. I do not think it has been made out that Scripture warrants the first conclusion; and yet the evidence on that point requires to be very clear and express. I hardly think any man of common sense will receive the reasonings of our friends from the New Testament. My friend Mr. Macbeth's interpretation of Ephesians vi. 9, was not a little extraordinary. It will not do for them to throw the burden of proof from the New Testament upon us. It lies upon them. If they cannot show that there was no kind of slavery practised in the Old Testament which did not exclude from all the privileges of the people of God, then clearly the burden of proof lies upon them. They must show the statute of repeal. Our friends must just take the position in which Dr. Wardlaw puts the opponents of infant baptism, when reasoning from circumcision, the sign and seal of the covenant of grace under the Old Testament, he demands from them "the statute of repeal;" and the position in which, in the Establishment controversy, we put our Voluntary friends, when we demonstrated the lawfulness of Establishments under the Old Testament, we demanded the statute of repeal under the New. My friend Mr. Macbeth seems to have felt the difficulty of his position when he referred to the Theocracy. I wish him, then, to say whether he believes that what is sinful and immoral, *per se*, and in all circumstances under the New Testament, was lawful under the Old. I know Dr. Willis will not say that. ["No," from Dr. Willis.] It belongs, therefore, to our friends either to show that no kind of slavery was tolerated under the Old Testament, or to show us the statute of repeal, before they can urge us to their conclusion. And I appeal to any man bringing common sense to what he has heard, to say if the reasonings have been so clear that points involving matter of immutable obligation are to be summarily settled with the word "Theocracy." Our friend should have shown that a theocracy can change the nature of moral obligation, and make that moral which is immoral, and that sinful which is lawful and right. This is just our old Voluntary watchword, which served for a sound argument. "O, it was a theocracy!" But we must see how it is applicable to the case.

Mr. Macbeth—I am ready to show it.

Mr. Gibson—Let us hear it, provided you do not argue the case.

Mr. Macbeth—Abraham was commanded to put to death his son Isaac; and things were lawful by express divine warrant which would not have been lawful otherwise.

Mr. Gibson—Those things were not made moral which before were immoral. That never was, and never could be, by a theocracy. But the things referred to—such as the judgments executed at the command of God on the Canaanites, and the like—were done, not because a theocracy could dispense with the everlasting principles of moral obligation; but they were done under the moral government of God, and as the righteous punishment of heinous and abominable wickedness. The case of Abraham was not the peculiarity of a theocracy, making that which was immoral, moral,—but it was a peculiar and miraculous interposition of God—a very different thing from that of sanctioning a system for ages alleged to be sinful, *per se*, and in all circumstances. Sir, let it not be alleged, because we cannot see our way to the extreme principles and practical conclusions of our friends, that we are the apologists of slavery. I feel it a degradation to be obliged to make such caveats. I felt it my duty to denounce the abominable atrocities of American slavery many years ago, and to take my own way of exposing them—aye, and that, too, when those who are now very discreditably raising a clamour against the Free Church were for another purpose veiling its enormities, and exhibiting America as the highest pattern of religion and morality. I wish not to recall these things. But they are yet vivid enough in our memories. But let me glance at the second point requiring to be made out by our friends. Supposing it made out that slave-holding or slave-having, *per se*, and in all circumstances, demands exclusion from the Lord's table, will that warrant the conclusion that we must excommunicate the American Churches? I have no hesitation, for my part, in saying that if an American slaveholder, be he minister or private member, sanctioning the atrocities there practised, and maintaining slavery as right and lawful, were to come to this country seeking admission to sealing ordinances and Church communion, that in any court of which I was a member, be it kirk session or superior judicatory, I would feel it my duty to raise my voice against his reception. But still that does not warrant me to come to the conclusion that we are to issue an indiscriminate sentence of excommunication against all the American Churches. Why, what do our friends ask? That this Free Church, forsooth, should take under its jurisdiction all the Churches of the earth, and exercise discipline upon the whole world. Are there not things in many Churches of Christendom, in their gross heresies and sins, demanding imperatively Christian discipline? There are things in the Church of England as offensive, in my view, to the order and purity of Christ's house, in matters of religion, as slavery is in point of humanity; but is the Free Church to sit down and pass the highest sentence of excommunication against the Church of England? Is it not the highest sentence of excommunication to refuse all intercourse of every kind, and that, forsooth, because other Churches do not exercise right discipline? If your principle be good, go through with it. A pretty course our friends would lead us. I fear, while pursuing it, our own discipline will be tolerably relaxed in the meantime.

Dr. Willis explained that they did not refuse intercourse with the American Churches.

Mr. Gibson—Why, then, do you complain of the Free Church? What else has she done? Has she ever entered into communion with the Churches of America?

Dr. Willis—I will answer that in my reply.

Mr. Gibson—I shall answer it by anticipation. What are the facts of the case? The Free Church, in the difficulties into which she was brought in the providence of God, and in obedience to the will of her great Head, sent a deputation to America to make known the oppressions she had endured, to proclaim her principles, and to take such aid as Providence should put at her disposal. But did she enter into any formal union, or acts of church communion of any kind, or command or authorise her deputies to do so? Most certainly not. I confess I should rather we had never taken money either from America or from England, simply because it involves us in certain practical difficulties which I foresaw from the beginning, and would rather we had avoided. But I hold it perfectly lawful to take the money which Providence thus set at our disposal; and to send it back would be as absurd as it would be injurious and destructive of the ordinary principles of human intercourse. The Scriptures do not entangle men's consciences with intricacies which it is impossible to explain or unravel. I never was more disposed to be ashamed of my countrymen than in witnessing the silly and senseless clamour raised about the money. A friend opposed to me on another question, asked me to say a few words on the discussion on slavery in the General Assembly. And if I had ventured to speak in that very able discussion, I would have begun by expressing my astonishment at the excitement raised among the intelligent inhabitants of Edinburgh by this silly and childish cry, "Send back the money!" The inhabitants of Glasgow have shown a little more sagacity, and have not been so easily moved. This senseless clamour implies, that if in the providence of God a certain portion of the silver and the gold, or the fruits of the earth, which is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, should be set free from an improper use, and applied to a good one, it must not be

received, but sent back into the hands of the ungodly, and kept there, or sunk into the deep sea. Is there any sense in that? But this is the principle affirmed in this clamour. Nay, why don't they cry—Send back the cotton and the sugar? Can that which is sinful and immoral in a Church be lawful and right in merchants? Can Dr. Willis be safe in eating rice? Should he not refuse to touch any such things, and not let a single fraction be paid for them, if the slaves should perish? Really, this clap-trap is nothing else than a wretched pandering to the vulgar appetite for money, and which can so easily attribute a contemptible motive where money is concerned.

Dr. Willis.—Does Mr. Gibson accuse us of engaging in this clap-trap agitation?

Mr. Gibson.—My dear Sir, you disclaimed it, and I believe you. But the course you pursue, and the principles you advocate, encourage it. If your principles be right, it is not clap-trap. It is quite right and proper. But it is because they are unsound it merits this description. My friend Mr. Macbeth proposes to be very free with this unlawful gain—with these stolen goods. He proposes to take the management, and make over this money to the suffering slaves. But really, our friend forgets himself. What right have we or has he to dispose of the stolen goods that have come into our possession? This is rather free-and-easy morality. He must send the money back to the civil magistrate of America, as the only party competent to deal with it. But the matter is really very serious. Our friends would drive us to very grave conclusions. There is another very serious difficulty in the case. They will not deny that there are many good men in these American Churches, fearing God, and hating slavery, and anxious to get rid of it; and yet we are asked to excommunicate these Churches in the gross. Our friends, before coming with such a demand, ought to have furnished us with some information, with statistics somewhat definite, as to the relative guilt and criminality of the parties, even though they were under our jurisdiction. They are at perfect liberty, and every man presiding in a session in the Free Church is at liberty, nay, bound, by her laws actually in force, to see the credentials of every man who seeks admission to sealing ordinances or to our pulpits,—that he be sound in the faith, and of credible religious profession and moral character; but are we to sit down and deliberately declare abstract sentences of excommunication in the mass upon all the Churches, American or otherwise, who do not themselves maintain a right Scriptural discipline? All this is undoubtedly implied in the principles affirmed by our friends. I must be allowed to say, that though I believe our friends sincerely to desire the welfare of the slave, they are not taking a very wise way to promote it. There was a phrase used by Dr. Buchanan, which in my view correctly describes this question, viz. that it is one of "religion and humanity." Let our friends take it up on this ground, and not set us on miserable disputes on questions of Church discipline—miserable in the circumstances, but raising important questions on matters in which men's religious opinions and conscientious convictions are involved; and setting us on self-defence, rather than uniting all men of every denomination in Great Britain in support of the poor slave, on the general grounds of religion and humanity. I cannot think that these disputes have originated, in certain quarters, from motives very creditable to the originators. Mr. Macbeth spoke of the Free Church as "isolated" in this question. This "isolation" is easily enough accounted for. Forced, in the way already noticed, to go out to other lands to tell her wrongs, and, in the providence of God favoured with a portion of their sympathy, a cry is raised where no cry had been raised before, and that by parties who did not "isolate" themselves from America till after the Scottish disruption. Let the voice of religion and humanity be united in Great Britain against the abominations of American slavery, and it will tell far more powerfully than internal discussions on points of Church discipline. Are we to forget that, whatever be the blame attachable to the American Churches, whom I have no interest either in opinion or otherwise to defend, there are other parties—the whole American people—every man who goes from Scotland, England, and Ireland, and from every soil—having a vote and an interest in this question, and they will care little for discussions in Church courts in Britain; they will never hear of them. Are we to forget that neither Church members nor other men can liberate their slaves without labour and means which are very often beyond their power, though they were willing; and that if they liberate them simply the law seizes and enslaves them to the State, and in more grievous bondage than ever. I cannot, for these reasons, as well as those stated by previous speakers, support the motion of Dr. Willis; and must again say that I do not think he is promoting the real interests of the slave by putting the Free Church on its defence, instead of uniting the general mind of this country in the cause of the slave, an expression of which would not be heard in vain, and would tell far more effectually than a miserable party agitation against the Free Church.

Mr. Finlay supported the overture.

Dr. Willis replied. He had pleasure in again addressing himself on the subject. He felt happy that the overture had been introduced; and he saw already the dawn of a better day in the minds of many of his brethren. In nothing did he more agree with several of the speakers than that important principles of Church fellowship were involved in the question; and he held that the present relations of this Church with the American Churches compromised it seriously on this head. Mr. Gibson (for that he might recollect what had been said, he would begin with the last speaker, and reply to those who preceded in order)—Mr. G. had alleged that if you carry out the principle of prohibiting intercommunion, on such grounds, you must carry it out indefinitely. No; even on the question of contributions to religious objects, that was not demanded. Dr. Willis referred here to the apostolic rule which permitted to eat what was sold in the shambles, asking no question, &c.—but which the apostle had qualified distinctly, in such a way as that we must discriminate: and are not to use our liberty to the stumbling of others, and the affecting injuriously their sense of right and wrong. The argument as to the retention of the money, he would state thus—Should that be retained which would never have been given if a decided testimony had been borne in that part of the world by our deputies, against the leading sin of the place; and if even the doctrine of Christ's Headship over nations, as well as churches, had been proclaimed?

Mr. Gibson—We do not admit that that was not done.

Dr. Willis—But I mean in the application of the doctrine to those laws which respect slavery, as the law forbidding the Scriptures to the slave, &c.

Gt. West.rn Advertiser Oct 17./46

126

To the Editor of the Great Western Advertiser & Chronicle.

London, October the 12th.

Sir,—Intemperate and ill-advised as I believe Mr. George Thompson to be in all his proceedings, I should not have taken the trouble to refer to his speech delivered in Bristol, had he not thought proper to refer to me therein, in a courteous and gentlemanly manner, which is however so characteristic of the man as in no wise to surprise me.

I believe I have in all I have written, and particularly through the columns of *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal*, a work to which I owe much of my literary success, expressed my abhorrence and dislike of slavery in sufficiently strong terms. I believe the institution, though rather older than the time of Las Casas, to be one of the most accursed upon earth, and one which every good, sincere, and honorable-minded man, will do his utmost to abolish and declare infamous. Great has been the example of England, an example which will have its effect in due time upon every portion of the globe. The question now is, how is it to be abolished in the United States of North America most speedily and most effectually? By vituperating and maligning the American people? By shutting them out by a moral ban from the pale of civilization? By cutting off all communication between them and the rest of the world? These are the means suggested by Mr. George Thompson. I heard him say at the Exeter Hall meeting that he looked upon the intercommunication between England and the United States, as a great evil; he regretted to see Englishmen and Americans fraternizing, because it was destroying the free character of our countrymen, with a vast amount of similar "sound and fury signifying nothing." I would say let everything be done to make brothers of the American people, let us not bully and threaten them, but rather cry "come let us reason together" and then see if we cannot, by the gentle arts of persuasion induce them to proceed more rapidly on the road towards abolition. Much has been already done towards this great consummation by calm and thoughtful men; nothing ever has, or ever will be done, by the abuse and calumny of Mr. Garrison and Mr. Thompson.

I opposed Mr. Thompson and his insulting charges against the whole American people, the Evangelical Alliance, and the Free Church of Scotland, at the Exeter Hall meeting, and afterward in print; and I exposed many of his mis-statements, to use no stronger word; he speaks of me accordingly as "a youth who boasts that he has enjoyed the hospitality of the slave-holder in the United States." My plain contradiction of this statement would necessitate the use of a word which might subject you to an action for libel; I will simply state that I never said anything of the kind. The meeting though packed by Mr. Garrison's and Mr. Thompson's satellites and supporters, contained a sufficient number of disinterested parties, members of the alliance and others, to make me wish to disabuse their minds as to the truth of the statements of the preceding speakers. Unfortunately, a large body of respectable persons, disgusted at the unchristian and almost impious language which was used, especially the statement by Mr. George Thompson that "an anti-slavery was necessarily an anti-clerical meeting," had left before I presented myself on the platform. The chairman, prompted by those around him, took care to assure the meeting that I was about to speak against the resolutions, when a burst of whistling, hissing, and other noises of a congenial kind, saluted me. During this uproar I made but a brief address, as I had no opportunity of letting them even know my name, so tremendous was the clamour raised around me, whenever the chairman *faintly* gave it forth. I said then, however, what I now repeat: that I had been much in America amongst the slave-owners, and I had not found them the inhuman monsters they had been painted; that many of them deeply regretted the existence of the institution, and would gladly hail the day when the system was abolished. I farther defended the Evangelical Alliance for not excluding slave-holders. I do so now. The Evangelical Alliance was not a body met together to devise means for doing away with negro slavery. It was a body which had in view the union of the Church of God in all parts of the world in a holy and fraternal alliance. Amongst those who came bringing their mite to this magnificent convention, were Americans, some from slave-holding states, and the accusation brought against the alliance by George Thompson, is that the alliance did not spurn them from among its body. This accusation is pretended to be brought in the name of Christianity, of that Saviour who went among publicans and sinners, seeking to convert them. What! the Evangelical Alliance is then to exclude these Americans, to turn its back upon them, to say "Go, you are hardened sinners, we believe not in your capability to repent, and will hold no communion with you." The Evangelical Alliance acted wisely in not being led into any such intemperate conduct. It received the Americans, it formed the Union, and it encouraged our Transatlantic brethren to visit England, and hold communion with us, the great apostles of anti-slavery. A greater blow was then struck at negro oppression than ever will be effected by Mr. Garrison's ridicule and abuse of everything clerical, and Mr. Thompson's assertion that eleven states of the Union are in the clutches of the devil.

Then, again, I said a few words for the Free Church of Scotland, which was most lavishly and unmeasurably abused by Mr. Thompson. Why? I could not gather, except that it had received support in money from America. Without extending into doctrinal differences and disputes, I have and always have had a great respect for the Free Kirk, as exhibiting a rare instance of self-denial and devotion on the part of a great body of people, a respect which, with me, is not wholly eradicated, because that body had taken some dollars towards its maintenance. Mr. George Thompson called the assembly of the Kirk, an assembly of man-stealers. I thought this insulting and impertinent from one of the above speaker's stamp, and I told him so, therefore I am "a youth," &c.

But whence in reality proceeds this virulence against the Alliance on the part of Garrison, Thompson, and others? Because the *Evangelical* Alliance excluded Unitarians and Quakers from this body. This is the grand secret of all this got up enthusiasm about slavery.

With respect to Mr. George Thompson's courteous mode of expressing himself in regard to me personally, I do not fear for one moment the judgment which will be formed by every right thinking man. It becomes Mr. Geo. Thompson, a hireling of the Anti-corn League, a paid agitator for the Rajah of Sattarah—whose cause he has ruined by his intemperance, while he has disgusted every East India proprietor—to speak of me in this flippant manner. He may cry until he is hoarse, he may quibble until he is lost in the mazes of his own calumnies and misrepresentations, but he will not, I think, easily persuade any one who knows me, or my writings, that I am a friend to slavery. No! I hate and abhor it, but my hatred and abhorrence of negro bondage will never make me vilify and abuse fourteen millions of Americans; it will not make me use my anti-slavery feelings as a covert to attack religion in the form of its ministers, as I honestly and firmly believe to be the case with many of those who pour forth their bile upon the Evangelical Alliance. I have the *Christian Witness*, the organ of the great congregational body, with me in thinking that Mr. Garrison's opinion is not worthy of being taken as to the piety of a great Christian body; of Mr. George Thompson's right to condemn and decry the belief of his fellow-creatures, I take leave to have my own doubts.

I have already, in the London *Mirror*, fully expressed my opinions of the Exeter-hall meeting and the anti-slavery league. I now leave the Bristol public to judge between "the youth" and Mr. George Thompson.

I remain, faithfully yours,

PERCY B. ST. JOHN.

P.S.—Any one who has read "The Whip and the Wish;" or, "Scipio Crackles," in *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal*, for August, will see how gross a calumny it is to accuse me of defending slavery.

Patriot Oct. 19. 1846 127

ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE AND THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

IMPORTANT MEETING AT AYLESBURY.

It will, no doubt, be in the recollection of the readers of the *Patriot*, that a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance was held a short time ago at Aylesbury, at which certain questions were put to the Chairman by Messrs. Gibbs and Hamilton, with reference to the exclusion of Quakers, and other professors of religion, and the inclusion of slaveholders within the pale of the Alliance. The answers to those questions not being deemed satisfactory, and the Chairman positively prohibiting anything in the shape of discussion, an announcement was thereupon made to the meeting by Mr. Hamilton, that a public meeting would be held in a few days, in the same place, to review the proceedings of the Alliance, and to take the sense of the people of Aylesbury, after the fullest discussion respecting the conduct of the 1,200 ministers and professors of religion, upon the important question of American slavery. In pursuance of the announcement then made, a public meeting was held on Thursday evening last, in the same place in which the Alliance held its meeting—the Town-hall—which was filled with a most respectable auditory, including several of the most talented ministers of the neighbourhood, and most of the influential members of the various religious denominations in the locality. Among the gentlemen upon the platform were, Dr. Lee, of Hartwell; the Rev. Messrs. Conder, of High Wycombe; Wycherley, of Tring; Green, of High Wycombe; Doxey, of Thame; Stalybrass, of Chesham; Terry, of Long Crendon; and Messrs. Gibbs, Hamilton, Gibbs, jun., Payne, &c., &c. The large hall was well filled, and the galleries were crowded.

Dr. Lee having been called to the chair, briefly explained the origin and object of the meeting; and in the course of his remarks, quoted from a Jewish prayer which he had met with, in which the petitions were inserted,—"Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast not made me a heathen. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast not made me a slave." (Hear.) He would leave them to draw their own conclusion from that extract.

The Rev. Mr. Wycherley, of Tring, then came forward to move the first resolution. He felt it to be his duty to say at the commencement, that the Anti-slavery League was not opposed to an evangelical alliance—(hear, hear,)—nay more, that many of its members and friends admire Christian union, seek it, and pray that it may be found existing not only in the holiday attire of public life, but in all the connexions of religious life. That the Evangelical Alliance was not with them, was not their fault. To review all the proceedings of that Alliance was no part of his design on that occasion. The proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance in Aylesbury he could not commend, the irritability of the respected and benevolent Chairman, his want of self-control, his severe, unmerited, and causeless censure of that respectable journal, the London *Patriot*, the fairness of whose reports had been generally commended, led him, as an observer, to to ask himself, Can this be a meeting for "Christian Union?" Are such the first ripe fruits of the Evangelical Alliance? Sir Culling had, in the first instance, applauded the provincial Press at the expense of the metropolitan; but, in a letter to the Editor of the *Patriot*, of Thursday, Oct. 9th, he had written as follows:—"Sir Culling Smith will only add that the expression in his speech at Aylesbury, contrasting the *Patriot* with other newspapers, was made hastily, and that he withdraws it." The omission of which Sir Culling complained, Mr. Wycherley said, he had the authority of the Editor of the *Patriot* for saying it was undesigned, nay more, purely accidental, and that he regretted it. He (Mr. Wycherley) blamed Sir Culling for censuring the Editor without previous inquiry, and for giving, unintentionally he had no doubt, a false or improper representation of the occurrence. Of the *Patriot* he need not say more, than that the religious public at large, and the Nonconforming bodies in particular, were deeply indebted to it for its liberal policy and its enlarged benevolence. (Loud cheers.) He was sure he best served the *Patriot* by rendering good for Sir Culling's evil, and praying that the next time the John Gilpin of the Evangelical Alliance should mount at Aylesbury, he must not ride further than he intended. Sir Culling was amazingly severe, studiously severe on some one reporting to the *Patriot* the proceedings of the Alliance, as though that individual had violated an oath of secrecy. This was the necessary fruit of an unwise policy. Why was the Press excluded? Were he meetings so warm at times as to require an abrupt termination of a debate, or a postponement of it until a future *sederunt?* The subjects of debate were, to his knowledge, freely spoken of by the members of the Evangelical Alliance at the firesides of their friends. They were also matter of correspondence to various parts of the world. The folly of the supposition, (that the sayings and doings of a thousand men meeting from all quarters of the globe for a fortnight in the metropolis, could be regarded as confidential) must be apparent to every one. He had carefully read the correspondence of Sir Culling and the editor of the *Patriot;* and would use the language of the *Patriot* itself, "Our accuser has doubly disappointed us, while exhibiting an irascibility of which we supposed him to be incapable; he seems devoid of that candour of which we gave him credit." He then referred to the 8th and 9th Articles of the scheme of organisation, which, as truths, he believed in; but asked, why were they there? and observed, it was said on authority that could not be questioned, it was to please the American delegates. While the parties in America referred to are thus dealt with, and not a word of expostulation with the southern man-stealer escaped the lips of that assembly, he could not divine. He denounced the slavery of America as a daring usurpation of the Divine prerogative, and a robbery of man's dearest rights,—as contrary to the golden rule; and, with great pleasure, proposed the first resolution, resuming his seat amid the cheers of the assembly.

Mr. Gibbs, of Aylesbury, upon coming forward to second the resolution, was received with loud cheers. He stated, that he highly approved of the professed objects of the Alliance; and, if peace and unity among Christians could be procured at any consistent price, he would at once join hand in hand in getting rid of that sectarian feeling which was the curse of English society; but he could not understand how a man who had endeavoured to compel the Dissenters, against their consciences, to pay for the dilapidations of the church, could turn round and say, "Dear brother, we must make an Evangelical Alliance." (Hear.) If any man was desirous of real Christian union, let him first

of all aid in the removal of those causes which lead to its impediment. The answer which Sir Culling Eardley Smith had recently given to him, (Mr. Gibbs,) respecting the exclusion of Quakers and the inclusion of slaveholders, upon the ground that the former body could not join the other members in vocal expressions of prayer and praise, he thought was a very ridiculous one; and the answer of Sir Culling Eardley Smith to the subsequent question of whether such exclusion was voluntary or involuntary on the part of the Quakers, he contended, was given either in irony or insult. The Quakers were also excluded, among other reasons, because they did not hold with the perpetuity of baptism. But let any one ask the members of the Alliance (although they professed to admit the perpetuity of that ordinance), how they would administer it. Some would say, to adults; others, to infants; some would dip, and others would sprinkle. All the world had better be Quakers, than avail themselves, as some members of the Alliance had done, of a piece of parchment to screw out the means for the administration of the ordinances. (Hear.) There were several members of the Alliance who were also acting with him (Mr. Gibbs) as members of the Anti-State-Church Society; but the latter was an aggressive society, declaring war against an existing evil, while the other might be called an Evangelical Principle-compromising Company. (Loud laughter.) Sir Culling Eardley Smith had made a statement about a friend of his (Sir Culling's) who was a proprietor in a Brazilian Mining Company; the attempt which he made, by reference to that individual's circumstances, to palliate slaveholding, was perfectly absurd.

The CHAIRMAN here offered a few words in apology for Sir Culling Eardley Smith, upon the ground of the difficulty of the hon. baronet's position as chairman.

The resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON was then announced, and, on presenting himself to the meeting, was greeted with loud applause. He spoke for upwards of two hours in support of a resolution, strongly condemnatory of the conduct of the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of slavery. He commenced by expressing his delight on finding himself in Aylesbury. At a former meeting in the County-hall, the audience had been told by the Rev. Mr. Adey, that the Evangelical Alliance was not the Anti-slavery Society—(laughter)—a piece of information quite superfluous, after the declaration of the hon. baronet in the chair, that he would sooner renounce the Alliance, than give up the fellowship he enjoyed with a Christian Brazilian-mining slaveholder. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Thompson) begged to inform his friends around him, that the Anti-Slavery League, with which he was connected, was not the Evangelical Alliance. (Cheers.) It was a mistake, however, to say, there *was* an Evangelical Alliance. There was no such body, technically considered. But there was an alliance which no opposition on earth, or from beneath, could successfully assail. (Hear.) It was the union, vital and indissoluble, of all of every name who had, by faith, embraced Christ. Their union was as close, compact, and intimate, as that of the stones of a building, or as that of the connexion between the branches and the stem of the vine. The members of this Alliance were not thus united, in consequence of any meeting in Freemasons'-hall; yet they were one. Yes, whether the follower and true disciple of Christ was in the log cabin of the American prairie, or the burning sands of Egypt; on the plains of Hindostan, or in the peaceful vales of England, he was a member of that glorious Alliance, of which Christ, and not Sir Culling Eardley Smith, was the head. (Cheers.) Having named the President of the late Conference, he wished to say, that he held the piety and benevolence of that estimable gentleman in the highest respect; but, at the same time, would take the liberty of saying, that the speech of that excellent person on the question of slavery, which he had made in that hall on the 29th of September, was a disgrace to a man professing to understand the genius of the Gospel and the requirements of the immutable and universal law of God. (Cheers.) Sir Culling would have to retract the horrid doctrine he had (he, Mr. Thompson, hoped, hastily,) promulgated—that one of the most pious and Christian men in London was a holder of slaves. This was a gross libel upon every other member of that body. To assume a right of property in one of God's immortal, accountable, and blood-redeemed creatures, was to dethrone the Deity: and, to send Christianity to the victim of so impious and atheistical an act, was to teach the slave that the man who asserted a right of property in him, was a man who had usurped the prerogative of Jehovah, and had trampled upon the unchangeable moral principles which were the foundation of human liberty, and the safeguard of human happiness. (Cheers.) Mr. Thompson then proceeded to give a detailed history of the doings of the Conference, from the morning of the 28th of August till the evening of the 2nd of September, and solemnly denounced the conduct of the 1,200 men who had deliberately refused (after four days' uninterrupted consideration of the subject) to record any condemnation of the unutterable crime of man-stealing. Mr. Thompson then referred to the history of several members of the Alliance, particularly of Dr. Olin, Dr. Patton, Dr. Smythe, Mr. Morse, and Dr. Cox. In reference to the last named gentleman, Mr. Thompson observed, that there had appeared in the columns of the *Patriot* of the 12th—(a paper which had laid the anti-slavery public of the country under the deepest obligations, by its calm, yet fearless vindication of sound abolition principles)—(cheers)—a letter written by Dr. Cox to the *New York Evangelist*. The bitterest enemy of Dr. Cox could not have desired that person to do anything more calculated to blast for ever his reputation as a minister of Christ. The spirit of the letter was absolutely fiendish. It appeared to have been written by a man utterly lost to all sense of decency, truth, and common sense. The wickedness of that letter was only equalled by the unexampled folly that had led to the penning of an epistle, which would do more to sink the writer to the lowest depths of degradation, than any aspersions or accusations that could emanate from any other quarter. Mr. Thompson then read the letter, which was heard amid manifestations of the most profound horror and disgust by the entire audience. He also pronounced a high eulogy on the character of Frederick Douglass, whom he declared incapable of the meanness, subserviency, and cupidity ascribed to him by Dr. Cox. Before concluding, Mr. Thompson inquired if the Rev Alexander Digby Campbell, of Aylesbury, was present, as that gentleman had arrived in the town by the same train with himself. There being no response, Mr. Thompson observed, that the absence of that gentleman was a significant fact. It argued either a want of

honesty, or a want of courage. (Hear, hear.) That gentleman was one of the secretaries of the Conference. If the Conference had done right, he should be there to defend it; if wrong, it was his duty to withdraw from it. (Cheers.) It was singular that no conspicuous member of the Alliance had dared to appear publicly in defence of that body, unless the letter of his reverend and beloved friend, Dr. Wardlaw—(hear)—was to be considered a defence. He (Mr. Thompson) sincerely regretted that so good and great a man as Dr. Wardlaw had guaranteed the anti-slavery character of the Americans; for he (Mr. Thompson) would undertake to prove in Glasgow, that, with a few noble exceptions, the American delegates were among the bitter and unrelenting persecutors of the only true and faithful abolitionists of the United States. He knew Dr. Wardlaw well,—enough, however, to feel assured, that he had only to be made aware of the fact to be induced to break off communication with such men, and declare himself on the side of the uncompromising friends of the truth.

The Rev. Mr. Conder, of High Wycombe, in coming forward to second the resolution, said, that he could not say that his hopes of the result of the Alliance had been disappointed; for himself and many others never expected it would succeed, although they devoutly wished it might. They foresaw, from the first, that wrong ground had been taken; that they should, instead of seeking uniformity of religious sentiment, have taken God's law, that Christians should love one another, though they might differ in opinion upon some points. But, though they had suffered disappointed hopes in respect to the recent Alliance, they had a confident expectation that they should not be disappointed with respect to another great evangelical alliance, whose failure they should not be called to mourn over, but to rejoice together at its existence—a time when there should be no slaveholders, because there should be no slaves; no Quakers, because there should be nothing to quake at; no Dissenter, because there should be nothing to Dissent from; when they should not have to make a creed, but when they should resolve that whatever be the peculiar views of another, if he would but come and take our hand as a Christian brother, we should hold out to him the arms of brotherly love. (Cheers.) There was already a great evangelical alliance, in which God did that which the recent conference had refused to do—excluded slaveholders from its pale. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Henry Clapp, of Lynn, Massachusetts, came forward to support the resolution. He stated that he came to that meeting with the recommendation of Dr. Cox, who, in alluding to his (Mr. Clapp's) connexion with the temperance movement, and because he had taken the liberty of affirming the truthfulness of Frederick Douglass, had denounced him (Mr. Clapp) in a recent letter to the *New York Evangelist*, as "a cold-hearted parricide." He, however, would fearlessly bear his testimony, that Frederick Douglass was one of the noblest men he ever knew; and, although a self-educated man, was great in intellect and powerful in speech, so much so, that there was not one of the most gifted of all the scholars and writers of New England who was not proud to listen to him. He (Mr. Clapp) had witnessed large assemblies gathered together in old Fancuil Hall, bestowing hour after hour, without taking the least note of time, to the words of the fugitive slave, Frederick Douglass. Mr. Clapp then entered into an explanation of the proceedings which took place in the World's Temperance Convention respecting the speech of Frederick Douglass; and, as a proof of the prejudice which existed in America against the coloured people, stated that, in Nantucket, the most anti-slavery part of America, a proposition had been made in the temperance body to admit coloured men to their intercourse as a society, which proposition was lost by a large majority. He (Mr. Clapp) well recollected Mr. George Thompson in America; for that gentleman had, upon one occasion, given him (Mr. Clapp) a sound whipping. He went to an Anti-slavery meeting, as a young man, to hear George Thompson, "the infidel" and "the Britisher," who had come over to America to interfere with their peculiar institutions. Mr. Thompson, however, inflicted such a castigation upon him that, although Mr. Thompson had forgotten it, he (Mr. Clapp) still retained a tingling recollection of the occurrence. (Laughter.) Mr. Thompson remained in America, fighting the battle of abolition as long as it was at all safe for him to do so, and, had he not left the country when he did, most certainly he would have been honoured with a martyr's grave. (Hear.) A furious crowd assembled in Boston; and, had they succeeded in finding George Thompson, beyond all question they would instantly have killed him as dead as Julius Cæsar. (Hear, and laughter.) They, however, did find William Lloyd Garrison, put a rope round his neck, led him through the streets, and, unless he had been rescued by several Truckmen, aided by other friends, they would have sacrificed his life. As it was, there was no place in Boston strong enough to protect the devoted abolitionist from the fury of the pro-slavery mob, except the city gaol, where Mr. Garrison was consigned for the night. (Cries of "Shame.") When the delegation to the Evangelical Alliance went back to America, the report of their proceedings here would infuse joy in the breasts of every slaveholder, and fill the hearts of the abolitionists with sorrow. The American abolitionists, however, were not deceived, for they had always a belief, that the deputation would "dodge" the Slavery question. (Hear.)

Mr. G. Thompson then asked Mr. Clapp fearlessly, whether the American Delegation to the Alliance were known in their own country in the character they wished to sustain here as slavery-abolitionists? He wished to have the testimony of Mr. Clapp upon that point, because that gentleman was an American.

Mr. Clapp replied, that, as an American abolitionist of some years' standing, and the Editor of an Anti-slavery newspaper, he begged to say, that Dr. Cox and his colleagues were not known at all in America as friends of the Anti-slavery cause, and that, if they were to present themselves at an Anti-slavery meeting, it would cause as much surprise as though the Bishop of London, the Lord Mayor, and a score of aldermen were to present themselves to take the pledge at a teetotal temperance meeting. (Laughter.)

The Rev. Mr. Doxey, of Thame, in a brief but most impressive speech, moved the thanks of the meeting to Messrs. G. Thompson, W. L. Garrison, F. Douglass, and the members of the Anti slavery League, for the noble stand they had made against the pro-slavery proceedings of the Alliance.

The Chairman expressed a wish, that the name of Mr. Henry Clapp should be included in the resolution.

The Rev. S. L. Green, of High Wycombe, seconded the resolution, and most eloquently eulogised the labours of Mr. George Thompson, who had been labouring for fifteen years in the cause of freedom, but who was never better employed than at the present

moment, in raising the standard of religion against the banner of cant—(cheers)—and in reforming a false evangelism by setting before men the great evangelical principle, "Whatever ye would that men should do unto you do ye also unto them." It was impossible for him to do justice to the character of that noble man, William Lloyd Garrison, whose extremely interesting life, from the pen of Mrs. Howitt, he would recommend all present to read, in a work called the *People's Journal*. To his (Mr. Green's) mind, never was the calmness and zeal of an Apostle, from the apostolic days to the present, so finely exhibited as in the character and career of William Lloyd Garrison. (Enthusiastic cheering.)

The resolution was put and carried amidst loud cheering.

Mr. Thompson, in returning his acknowledgement, detailed the principles and objects of the Anti-Slavery League, and solicited the co-operation of the friends of negro emancipation throughout the world in carrying out its benevolent and Christian views.

Mr. James Grace then moved the following resolution, which, having been seconded by Mr. G. Thompson, was passed unanimously.

"That the thanks of this Meeting be given to Messrs. Gibbs and Hamilton, for their united perseverance in putting the three questions to the recent Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance; viz., 1. The exclusion of the Society of Friends. 2. The inclusion of slave-owners and holders. And 3. The non-exclusion of Free Churchmen who participate in the proceeds of Slavery.

Mr. Giles briefly returned thanks.

Mr. Hamilton, replying for himself, stated, that he had felt strongly upon the question of slavery, in connexion with the Free Church of Scotland, of which he had been a member, and with the press of which body he had formerly been connected. He had, at one time, thought that the grandest demonstration which was ever made upon earth in modern times of uncompromising Christianity, was the movement which took place in Edinburgh some three years since, when 500 ministers left their all, as it was supposed, to follow Jesus Christ. (Hear.) He had now, however, to declare, that an attentive perusal of the Bible had led him to the conviction, that, as Gideon's camp required to be sifted a second time, so would the Free Church of Scotland. (Hear.)

The Rev. Mr. Stalybrass moved, and the Rev. Mr. Terry seconded a vote of thanks to the Chairman, for his services, and to the sheriff, for the use of the county hall, which resolution was also carried unanimously.

The Chairman returned thanks, and the meeting separated near midnight.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

(From our own Reporter.)

One of the most densely packed meetings which it is possible to conceive was held on Friday evening last, in the capacious Lecture-room, in Nelson-street, the largest available building for the purpose in the town, but wholly inadequate, as it turned out, for the wants of the meeting. Upwards of 2,000 individuals were crammed into an edifice only containing comfortable sitting-room for some hundreds less than the vast assembly which were wedged within its walls. Every avenue, passage, and window at which the sound of the speakers voices might by possibility reach, was filled to suffocation, and hundreds remained outside in the streets, upon the remote possibility that the compact mass of human beings might be squeezed into a still greater degree of solidity, and they might thereby be brought within hearing of the address of the transatlantic apostle of abolitionism, and the eloquent pleadings and denunciations of the equally celebrated British champion of freedom and human rights, by whom he was accompanied. Had it not been for the advanced period of the year and the unfavourable state of the weather, the meeting would doubtless have been adjourned to the open air, where at least double the number would have attended to those who could gain admission to the Lecture-room in Nelson-street. It was with some difficulty that Messrs. Garrison and Thompson, the deputation from the Anti-Slavery League, could obtain admission, from the compactness with which the avenues were filled. Upon presenting themselves upon the platform, those gentlemen were welcomed with reiterated bursts of applause, the cheering from the inside of the building being echoed by the shouts of the crowds who were unwillingly compelled to remain without, and who maintained their position in the streets during the whole evening, as though some inspiration might be caught or some gratification were derivable even from exercising the power of vision upon the dead walls, when the ear could not be gratified by the sounds of the living voices within, so eloquently and powerfully raised in behalf of suffering humanity. The only active part which this outer congregation were enabled to take in the evening's proceedings was that of most vociferously cheering Messrs. Garrison and Thompson, as they took their departure from the house upon the termination of the meeting at twelve o'clock at night. It is admitted on all hands, that this meeting was the most enthusiastic which has been held for a very long time in this proverbially spirited town. In Newcastle upon-Tyne, as elsewhere, the expression of condemnation of the Evangelical Alliance has been unanimous and unequivocal,—not as an Evangelical Alliance *per se*, but in the pro-slavery action which it is contended they adopted, from the mistaken but unworthy motive of conciliating those whom they were unhappily led to denominate their "American brethren;" but whom the opinion of the British Christian public, as well as the truly evangelical voice of the whole world, has now pronounced, ought not, however influential and talented, to have been received into the Conference at all, while the guilt of prostituting their spiritual functions to sanction slavery attached to them, or who having through fortuitous circumstances obtained admission, should not have been permitted, either by threats or blandishments, to induce the British and Continental delegates to swerve from the fundamental Christian duty of protesting against that foulest of all sins, the enslavement of a fellow man, displayed in the foulest of all its forms —American slavery. The chair was taken by the veteran advocate of freedom, Dr. Headlam, the intimate friend and associate of the late Earls Grey and Durham; whose consistent career of benevolence and freedom has rendered him the most influential man in the district, and in testimony of whose respect the inhabitants of Newcastle-upon-Tyne have recently, for the third time, elected him the Mayor of their important town.

This morning a public breakfast was given at the large room, Wilckie's Temperance Hotel, to Messrs. Garrison and Thompson. In the absence of the Mayor, the chair was filled by the Rev. Mr. Harris; and,

although the proceedings of the morning were of a more social and conversational nature than those of the previous evening, they were felt to be not less deeply interesting to the friends of Negro emancipation. A branch of the Anti-Slavery League was formed, and a great number of names were immediately enrolled, the greatest determination being expressed zealously and systematically to promote the funds, and forward the interests of that new organisation. Some regret was expressed at the unavoidable absence from the town of the Rev. Mr. Pringle, who, a short time since, seceded from the Alliance upon the slavery question, and whose presence at the meeting was fully anticipated.

Messrs. Garrison and Thompson have just left this town for Liverpool, where a large public meeting will be held on Monday evening next; after which, as already announced, they will hold a series of meetings in some of the principal towns in Scotland and Ireland. The feeling upon this subject is growing with remarkable rapidity; and the above-named gentlemen, it is stated, have received applications, by letter or deputation, from the inhabitants of nearly all the large towns in the kingdom, which Mr. George Thompson, in conjunction with other members of the Anti-slavery League, intends to comply with as early as possible, but in the labours of which Mr. Garrison's speedy return to America will prevent him participating beyond the 4th of next month.

The late hour to which the proceedings of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne meeting were prolonged, and the intervention of the Sabbath, compels us to postpone the detailed report of these interesting meetings until the next number of the *Patriot*.

(From the *Hull Advertiser*.)

The boasted Evangelical Alliance has sowed the wind, and is reaping the whirlwind. Its late labours at the grand Conference in the metropolis were of an extraordinary character. It began with excluding the press, and it ended with opening its arms to receive to its fraternal embrace the slave-owners and slave-breeders of the Southern States of America! That the press was excluded from the deliberations of an assembly capable of including Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaws, of a region where provident fathers are not unfrequently in the habit of selling for hard dollars their own illegitimate offspring, we regard as a compliment. But there were some faithful men present, who, though outvoted at the Conference, are nobly exerting themselves to wipe this foul stain from the religious character of England. The proceedings were not wholly stifled. One independent and admirably-qualified member furnished the *Patriot* with daily summaries of the proceedings, for the publication of which the Editor deserves the thanks of the public at large, and for which he has received the abuse of Sir Culling Eardley Smith. Recently, however, another member of the Conference has stood forward to denounce to the world the derelictions of that body in a voice which will be heard wherever the English language is read. We allude to the celebrated George Thompson, whose burning eloquence has withered up so many of the world's abuses. Last week he lectured on the subject in Bristol, and he has pledged himself to appear at Liverpool to confront that Jonah of the slaveholders, the Rev. Dr. Cox, of Brooklyn, New York, whom the stranding of the Great Britain has forced back to answer for his conduct in traducing the abolitionists immediately before the sailing of that vessel.

Well may the Editors of the *Patriot*, the *Nonconformist*, the *Christian Witness*, and the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, represent the Evangelical Alliance as having damaged the abolition cause throughout the world. It is one of the disgraces of the Christian name in England, that such a body should open its arms to the slave-breeder, and close them against such men as Dr. Channing, merely on the ground of his religious opinions! Popery leads to slavery, and, therefore, the whole Roman Catholic world is excluded; but dear darling slavery, in the person of her Evangelical delegates from South Carolina, is received with open arms! Well may the good and honest men who laboured for so many years to abolish slavery mourn over this consummation of the labours of the so-called Evangelical Alliance.

The sooner the Evangelical Alliance is now dissolved the better it will be for the peace of the Christian world. The experiment of the utility of such an association has been made, and it has signally and completely failed. It has fostered jealousies—it has sown dissentions—it has kindled strife, among men who previously were accustomed to regard each other as brethren. Divines are of all men the most easily heated by controversy, and, in losing their temper, too often lose their judgment. Unless, then, the Alliance be speedily broken up, we may be prepared for much angry discussion on both sides of the Atlantic. We forsaw what it would end in from the hour it was decided not to admit the representatives of the Press. We felt certain there was little real unanimity, and that, on the part of some portion of the members, a dishonest juggle was intended. Had the reporters of the Press been present at all the Conferences, is it to be supposed that it would have been possible to carry the pro-slavery resolution? We trust the proceedings and the fate of this body will prove a warning to Christians of all denominations not again to court darkness when they are deliberating about the temporal and eternal welfare of the human race.

(From the *Manchester Times*.)

Three points have been established by this meeting. First, that in Manchester there is no abatement in zeal for the abolition of slavery; second, that there is a great proportion of abolitionists who decidedly disapprove of the virulence with which religious associations in this country are assailed by the Anti-Slavery League; and third, that there is a strong wish that the Evangelical Alliance should take bolder ground, and, by a direct vote, rather than by indirect arrangements, exclude all slaveholders, and all apologists for slaveholding, from their communion. We trust that both associations will be the better for the lesson.

THE REV. M. M. CLARK ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.

(From the *Norfolk News*.)

We are glad to re-print, as prominently as possible, the following letter (this letter appeared in the *Patriot* of the 12th inst.) addressed to the editor of the *Patriot*, by the Rev. M. M. Clark, the gentleman whose speech at the recent Evangelical Alliance meeting has given rise to so much discussion in this neighbourhood:—

We have read this letter, and we have no doubt the Norwich abolitionists will read it with great satisfaction. Mr. Clark has now justified, more fully than any

one else could have done, the course taken in calling the late anti-slavery meeting. He says that his opinion, on the whole subject, has undergone a beneficial change, and that this change has been wrought by the very discussion which has, in many quarters, been so much deprecated. That discussion he regards "as providential, tending much to inform the public mind, as well as to give me clearer views of what is Christian duty regarding slavery." The two objects proposed by the meeting have thus, according to the very best testimony, been amply attained. The letter also demonstrates, that, whatever may have been the exact words originally employed by Mr. Clark, they were used to recommend a proceeding which he now considers wrong —on grounds which he now abandons as untenable. It is clear that Mr. Clark intended to represent slaveholding as no disqualification for church fellowship, and the conduct of the Alliance as, therefore, a legitimate and charitable concession to the difficulties, or rather the inability, of certain involuntary slaveholders. He now repudiates both the premises and the conclusion. Whatever those difficulties may be, Mr. Clark has arrived at the simple, just, and Christian decision, that it is the imperative duty of the church, and, consequently, of the Alliance, to protest publicly against slaveholding, by a sentence of absolute exclusion.

It is said that Mr. Clark has been too severely handled. If so, we are sure that the Norwich abolitionists will regret it, and none more than Mr. Clark's candid and charitable, though outspoken opponent, Mr. Brock. But it deserves to be remembered, that the opinions which Mr. Clark now renounces, were especially objectionable as proceeding from a person of his class. We are quite willing to make the allowance for which he asks, on the ground of his immediate contact with slavery and its darkening influences; but the liability to mistake from these causes is not sufficiently, if at all, appreciated by the British public; and, therefore, any palliation of the guilt of slave-holding, or any plausible attempt to lower the standard of Christian testimony on the subject, by such a man, was especially calculated to mislead an audience benton union, and naturally anxious to extend it as far as possible. Mr. Clark is an American, and, consequently, supposed to be well acquainted with all the facts of the case. Mr. Clark is one of the oppressed race, and, consequently, supposed to be clear of all bias unfavourable to the interests of his brethren. Mr. Clark is a minister of a Christian church, and, consequently, supposed to be not unfaithful to the first principles of Christian discipline. On these accounts Mr. Clark's error was pre-eminently dangerous, and a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance was, as we have seen, pre-eminently the sphere in which such an error would produce its worst consequences. If the American slaveholders had set their wits to work in order to invent a scheme for impregnating England with the contagion of transatlantic prejudices, and for blinding the good people on this side of the water with the "darkening influences" of slavery, they could not have hit upon a better than an organisation for universal union, to be addressed by such an advocate as Mr. Clark.

We thank this gentleman, therefore, the more for his honest recantation; but we must be allowed to say, that it does not yet appear to us complete, in consequence, it may be, of some lingering influences of a corrupted and corrupting atmosphere. Mr. Clark does not yet seem to take a correct view of the position of "Christian slaveholders." He now admits that there is no law prohibiting emancipation, but pleads the difficulties in the way, arising from the liability of the slave to be recaptured under certain circumstances. Does he mean to say, that this is the reason why the Christian slaveholders do not emancipate their slaves? If he does not, why allege this excuse, instead of telling us the real motives? If he does, we must be allowed to test the accuracy of his statement by the following questions. Do the Christian slaveholders, or any number of them, endeavour, by any means, to get rid of the laws which they profess to regard as standing between themselves and their duty to their fellow-men? Do the Christian slaveholders, or any number of them, in the meanwhile treat their slaves substantially as free men, by abolishing distinctions of colour—by renouncing all arbitrary power—by paying just wages—by refusing to sever husband and wife, or parent and child? Do the Christian slaveholders, or any number of them, repudiate such abomination as "Jim Crow" pews and separate administrations of the Lord's Supper? Do the Christian slaveholders, or any number of them, sympathise with the runaways, instead of assisting an accursed law to re-clasp them within its gripe? Do the Christian slaveholders, or any number of them, help on the cause of abolition by the Press, by the Pulpit, by petitions, by public agitation or private efforts, by a single smile of encouragement or a single word of favour? They do not, and Mr. Clark must know that they do not. They do not; and therefore to talk of the difficulties with which the freed negro might possibly be beset, as an excuse for continued slaveholding, is to use language which, when employed by the delinquents, must be regarded as hypocritical, when by their advocate, as at best mistaken.

The American Anti-slavery Society gives a very different explanation of the matter. They, too, say, that some slaveholders are more favourable to abolition than others, but their conjecture of the causes which keep this class from going further, is a far less flattering one than that of Mr. Clark. In their account of slavery, addressed to and published by the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, they tell us—"We cannot avoid the conviction that nearly all the sympathy of the country in behalf of the slaves, is to be found among the abolitionists. There are doubtless some at the north, and we know many at the south, who secretly remember, to some extent, them that are in bonds, but not as bound with them. Fear, pride, self-interest, public sentiment, or mistaken notions of policy, constrain them to hide their sympathies in silence. Of such, we have reason to believe, there are many scattered over the slave states, who are struck dumb by the threats of Lynch-law. That there may be a considerable number likewise in the free states, who would willingly be abolitionists if abolition were less unpopular, we are not disposed to doubt."

And what are the argumentative tactics of the American Christians who have thus disgracefully submitted to the dictation of a bloody and tyrannical power? Let the American Anti-Slavery Society again be heard. "If they speak of slavery at all, it is to cavil about the doctrine of its being in all cases sin, and to expose their want of sympathy for the slave by speculating about imaginary cases, in which they suppose that slaveholding would not be sin."

We may now understand who are the parties that have raised this cry, and why it has been imported into this country. And we may now venture, without being suspected of calumny or exaggeration, to express our belief that the American delegates, with few exceptions,

crossed the Atlantic for the very purpose of covering their own shame with the mantle of British Christianity, and with the intention of using the Evangelical Alliance as a convenient cat's paw. We should have had to lament still more than we now do the success of their manœuvre, if the appeal to the public, just made, had not exposed, in the full glare of day, the subterfuges and criminality of Christian slaveholding, to which English Christians have been too long and too supinely indifferent.

Patriot Oct. 19. 1846

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

(From the *Watchman.*)

Preliminary to any further remarks which we may feel it our duty to make on the efforts in progress, through the means of the platform and a portion of the press, to hide the success of the Evangelical Alliance, we would submit the following two propositions to the attention of our readers :—

1. A movement for the healing of strifes and divisions in the Church, for the uniting together of Christian brethren holding the head, and, consequently, for the advancement of the Saviour's kingdom and glory, is so high, so holy, so heavenly an undertaking, that it would be contrary to all history, to all experience, to all sound views of the reality and extent to which Satanic agency operates in our world, to expect that it could go forward to a prosperous consummation without encountering numerous and formidable difficulties.

2. Satan, who can clothe himself as an angel of light and quote Scripture when it serves his purpose, would, naturally, in this case,—knowing that he had to deal not with unconverted, thoughtless, worldly-minded men, so much as with those who reverence the Word of God and desire the temporal and eternal welfare of their fellow creatures,—tax his ingenuity to devise schemes which might have a plausible semblance of religious principle and feeling to the hostility arrayed against the movement.

Assuming that these propositions are conceded, we can easily understand the character of the opposition—open and covert—to the Alliance, which is now carried forward, and which, through various misconceptions, misrepresentations, and delusions, has engaged, to a greater or lesser extent, the sympathies of some, the sincerity of whose desire for Christian Union we should be amongst the last to question. The most prominent and aggressive Anti-Evangelical Alliance influence in present operation, however, is, that of the so-called "Anti-Slavery League." Admit that the vagrant speech-makers who principally figure at the meetings of this "League" are bankrupt in everything that should command the attention of respectable and truth-loving assemblages,—(and, we need scarcely say that we do much more than admit this,)—still they have a hold on the popular mind through their ostentatious parade of attachment to the cause of liberty, which greatly facilitates their assaults on the Alliance. We feel bound to record our protest against the reckless course now pursued by "Messrs. Garrison and Co.," and to warn the unwary against falling into the mistake that those reckless agitators are the friends either of man or God. Christians who understand the case, must feel it a duty to discourage, frown down, and, by all becoming means, suppress their mischief-loving, and mischief-making proceedings.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND SLAVERY.

Sir,—Will you favour me by finding a place in your columns for a very few thoughts, which arose in my mind after an attentive perusal of Dr. Wardlaw's recent letter on the Evangelical Alliance and American slavery? I regret to be obliged, conscientiously, to disallow the reasonings, and, therefore, to reject the conclusions, of an eminent servant of God: but, to adapt the Doctor's adaptation, *Amicus* Wardlaw; *magis amica veritas.*

Premising, then, that, in very many of the excellent sentiments of your Correspondent's letter, and, most sincerely, in his abhorrence of the system of slavery, whether in America or elsewhere, I most cordially agree with him, I shall confine my remarks to one or two points of his communication, in which, I respectfully submit, he is wrong.

I. Dr. Wardlaw, in speaking of the difficulties of the question of American slavery, very properly acknowledges, that there are "cases of debateable casuistry, not imaginable only, *but real*," (the italics are mine,) in "which the decision of the question of duty may be somewhat difficult." This he readily concedes. He states further: that we should make "charitable allowance" for those who are placed in "circumstances so peculiar." But, he adds: "Nothing in their condition can ever be an excuse for our implicating ourselves, more or less, directly or indirectly, in the evil, by any kind, or any measure, either "of communion or of connivance." Now, I cannot bring myself to think, that Dr. Wardlaw really means what the excessive strength of his expressions seems to signify. To refuse to one of our redeemed fellow-creatures,—to one, moreover, whom your Correspondent readily acknowledges to be placed in circumstances so peculiar that charitable allowance ought to be made for him,—*any kind of communion*, seems to be utterly irreconcileable with the principles of Christianity. But let that pass. I will suppose, that Dr. Wardlaw means simply, that he would deny to him *such a measure of communion*, as would appear to be involved in permitting him to take his place in the ranks of the Evangelical Alliance. Now, I humbly think, that it is just here that the Doctor's argument completely fails. He contends, that the admission of a slaveholder, under any conceivable circumstances, into the Alliance, will "implicate" those who admit him "in the evils" of the system of slavery. Now, surely this is not sound logic. I most conscientiously think, that there are "evils" in the system of Dissent; but I do not think, that, by affectionate union with good Dissenters, I "implicate" myself in those "evils." My Dissenting friends think, that there are "evils" in our Church of England system, and some of them have spoken most strongly, but, I dare not doubt it, most conscientiously, about those evils; and yet I conclude, that, by affectionate communion with me, they do not mean me to believe, that they thereby "implicate" themselves in any Church of England evils. Are there no "evils" in the system of war? I, for one, should feel it difficult to decide which of the two, war or slavery, had inflicted the worst evils on the human race. But are pious generals and religious colonels to be excluded from our ranks; or, if we allow them to march with us, in the same peaceful regiment, are we to be considered as "implicating" ourselves in the evils of war? Certainly not. And I therefore request Dr. Wardlaw (for I most earnestly desire to be set right by him, if I am wrong) to tell me plainly why the Alliance can admit Churchmen and Dissenters, and officers of the army and navy,

without implication in the real or supposed evils of their respective systems, but that every slaveholder must necessarily be excluded, or that *implication* in the evils of slavery must assuredly be the result?

II. I do not quite like Dr. Wardlaw's observations on the Americans. I am sure that he means well by them. I am certain that he regards them with affection. But to my mind there is an appearance of unfair dictation in some of his remarks. In one place, he says of our American friends :—"They pleaded that they might be allowed to act out their principles, on their return from this country, as Americans, and without the imputation and suspicion of British influence; assuring us (and who can doubt the truth of it?) that such suspicion and imputation would materially impair, if not entirely destroy, the efficiency of their efforts. *They return thus free.*" But, immediately after this plain declaration of their perfect freedom in this matter, the Doctor adds :—"*They know the consequence*, if there should be any, the smallest, tampering with principle on this subject." Now, what does this mean? I can only read it in this manner. Here is a disputed question between Dr. Wardlaw and his American anti-slavery brethren. The question is—"Is it right, under certain peculiar circumstances, to admit a slaveholder into the Evangelical Alliance?" Dr. Wardlaw answers in the negative: his American friends in the affirmative. "Well, then," says Dr. Wardlaw, "we will not settle the question now. You shall go back to America quite free to act in the matter according to the dictates of your conscience. Remember, you are quite free; but let me tell you this: If in any, the smallest, degree, you tamper with principle by the introduction of a single slaveholder, *you know the consequence*." Now, really, if this is a fair view of the case (and I am not conscious of having at all distorted Dr. Wardlaw's reasoning in this matter), I cannot see in what the freedom of the American consists.

But I do not wish to prolong this letter. There are one or two other points in which I think Dr. Wardlaw is rather an asserter, than a reasoner. For instance, the statement that "it is foolish to talk of any difference between the sin of slavery and the sin of slaveholding," would, I think, be very difficult to prove. I can very easily conceive a very great difference between them. So, also, with respect to the assertion that "there always remains the resource of quitting a country where the slaveholder finds he can no longer live without breaking the laws of God." But there are many slaveholders, who are quite as much opposed to the system of slavery as we are, who yet conscientiously believe, that, under the peculiar circumstances of their cases, it is God's will that they should continue where they are. But I will not dwell on these points. To treat them properly would require more space than I have any right to ask.

The two questions, then, which I wish respectfully to put to Dr. Wardlaw, are these: First, Is it right to say, that, by the admission of slaveholders into the Alliance, under any circumstances, we necessarily implicate ourselves in the evils of slavery? and, secondly, Is it fair to our American brethren to tell them, in the same breath, that they are free to act in the matter according to their consciences; but that they know the consequence, if the decision of their consciences shall be different from that of others?

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

WM. WITHERS EWBANK.

Everton, near Liverpool, Oct. 15, 1846.

[Without interfering between the Reverend Writer of the foregoing letter and the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, with respect to those matters on which they are at issue, we offer two remarks.

1. We infer, that Mr. Ewbank, for one, *is* prepared to "concede the point" of admitting slaveholders, under certain circumstances, into the Evangelical Alliance, and that, should another General Conference ever be convened, he will contend and vote for their admission.

2. Mr. Ewbank's letter reminds us of a report that reached us, to the effect, that the American delegates threatened to make a stand for the exclusion of persons dealing in the *souls* of men, (*i. e.*, Established clergymen,) if a stand should be made for the exclusion of persons dealing in the *bodies* of men.—ED.]

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.—A meeting was convened in the Secession church, Stonehaven, on Monday, the 5th October, to afford the Rev. G. Philip, and G. Scott, an opportunity of communicating information from the Conference recently held in London. Mr. Scott, at considerable length, placed before the audience a full view of the preliminary proceedings and the business done at the Conference. The description given by Mr. Scott of the discussion on slavery excited the deepest interest, and his explanations regarding the rescinding of the resolution anent slavery, and the final adoption of a scheme of organisation, which, while it relieved the minds of the most scrupulous, avoided committing the Alliance to any explicit deliverance on the subject of slaveholding, *seemed* most satisfactory.—*Witness.*

Liverpool Times Oct 20. 1846

ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.
MEETING OF THE DELEGATES AT THE CONCERT HALL.

A public meeting of the Anti-Slavery advocates was held last night at the Lord Nelson-street Concert Hall, to meet a delegation of the Anti-Slavery League, consisting of Mr. W. Lloyd Garrison, President of the American Anti-Slavery Society; Mr. Frederick Douglas, a fugitive from slavery in Maryland; and George Thompson, Esq., the well-known Anti-Corn-law advocate of our own country. The hall was densely crowded, but no person appeared upon the platform other than a few friends of the above-named gentlemen, and whose names were unknown to our reporter.

GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq., having been unanimously voted to the chair, said he would not disguise from them his feelings on that occasion, in taking that chair. He would have preferred, infinitely preferred, that some other person had occupied that situation; but the fact was they had asked no individual in this town to preside upon that occasion. They were there to utter the language of truth on certain topics that night, in reference to which they were ignorant of the feelings and opinions of the persons there assembled, and also of those out of doors in this town. They asked no man to commit himself to the smallest extent, to the views which they held on certain vexed questions, before he had heard the whole truth upon that question. They (the audience) were there to listen to certain gentlemen, who, in the discharge of their solemn duty, would bring

before them the true character of American slavery—its true character as exhibited in various parts of the United States, and also the conduct of certain parties in this country, upon that subject. All he asked of them was, that they should listen with unprejudiced and impartial minds, and that they would hold the parties upon that platform guiltless of any wish to influence the opinion of any human being in the world—any farther than he in his judgment believed that influence to be a good influence, and the reputation of those parties to be a good and sound one—or to go out of their way for the purpose of attacking the religious prejudices of any body of Christians in this country. Once for all he would deny, with all the emphasis possible, the truth of certain malicious accusations that had been brought against the parties then before that meeting. It was not the first time that he had stood upon a platform in Liverpool to advocate the extinction of slavery. (Cheers.) He believed he had the honour many years ago—in the days of comparative youth—of being the first person that ever addressed a large public audience in the town of Liverpool with reference to the abolition of negro slavery. (Cheers.) From that time to the present his views had remained unchanged, and he had felt it his duty to ascertain, as far as he was able, who were and who were not the sincere and uncompromising friends of the slave. He was there that night to declare his honest conviction that there was not on the face of the globe a more devoted, uncompromising, disinterested, self-sufficient friend of the negro than his distinguished brother then before them—William Lloyd Garrison. (Loud cheers.) The secret of the bitter enmity cherished against that person was, that while other abolitionists had willingly committed themselves to the support of anti-slavery doctrines while popularity was to be won by their advocacy, but were very unwilling to do so when nothing but odium and hatred were to be gained, his friend Garrison, unlike such abolitionists, had been an abolitionist in all weathers, though perhaps the weather with which he had to contend for the last 15 or 16 years had been invariably rough weather—stormy weather—weather which made many men lose courage, hide their heads, and look out for shelter; his friend's offence was this—that in the prosecution of his holy enterprise he had not failed to rebuke, with earnestness and impartiality, the professors of Christianity of all denominations in the United States, who had given the sanction of their names, and, what was worse, attempted to give the sanction of Christianity itself to the unutterably horrid and criminal system of enslaving men. (Hear.) There had been certain American ministers of religion over in this country belonging to the Presbyterians of the United States, the Episcopalian Methodists of the United States, the Baptists in the United States, and many other religious denominations, going through this country maligning his friend—bringing charges against him—trying to destroy his influence, because he had for the last 15 years been rebuking their slothfulness and sins in the matter of slavery. He had been occupied during that period in denouncing the atrocious conduct of the churches of the United States, which were the bulwarks of American slavery. That was the secret of the bitter opposition to his friend Garrison. (Hear, hear.) Why did Dr. Cox, of New York, stand up in this town and utter calumnies without foundation, and as false as they could be? Because that recreant abolitionist had been by his friend exposed as he deserved to be, and exposed as he should be—(cheers)—while there was a British audience in this country that would grant him (Mr. T.) a hearing, or an impartial journal that would publish the truth. That man had dared to say that Mr. Lloyd Garrison, and the parties then on that platform, were men of no character; that they were leagued together to overthrow human government; to abrogate the Sabbath; to plead the cause of woman's rights, while they disregarded woman's honour. That they were the preachers of high treason against the Government of the United States; that they desired to take the sword out of the hands of the magistrates; that they were taking steps to encourage a civil war in America, more unnatural than the battle of Chevy Chase and the Wars of the Roses in this country. Dr. Cox had dared to utter that language, coward as he was, within twenty-four hours of the time when he thought he should quit the shores of this country—before his libels could appear in print—still more before they could reach the eyes or ears of the absent parties whom he accused. He (Mr. T.) declared that every word that that miscalled minister of religion uttered on that occasion was a falsehood. He had come there to prove it. He had challenged Dr. Cox to meet him either on the platform or in the public press, and he now challenged any friend of that individual in Liverpool—he challenged his esteemed friend, the Rev. W. Bevan, the Liverpool Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, to meet him on that platform and defend Dr. Cox, for having desecrated his character as a Christian, for having violated his office and brought disgrace upon himself and Christianity, by uttering the grossest libel ever promulgated by man. That was a free meeting: let any defender of Dr. Cox appear that night; let any defender of the Evangelical Alliance appear; let any friend of the Free Church of Scotland appear, and he was prepared to vacate that chair, to give him that platform, and allow him without limit to defend the charge he brought against that individual; and he would pledge himself to succeed in proving that there was ground for the charge he openly preferred. (Cheers.) He had made these remarks in opening that meeting, in order that all might be in full possession of a knowledge of the object the Anti-slavery delegates had in view; and it would be for the meeting to judge, at its conclusion, of the character of Dr. Cox—who, professing to be the friend of the slave, brought a most unfounded charge against a man whose whole life had been devoted to the cause of the slave. He should now call upon his friend Frederick Douglas to address them; but, before doing so, he would say a few words regarding him. He was a slave. He stood in his master's ledger as a piece of property; they would hear speak that night a chattel *persona*, who could do nothing, possess nothing, that did not belong to his master; they would hear a piece of property speak. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He was still a slave, if the claim of his master could make him one, or if the law of the United States could make him one; he was a truant slave, a runaway slave, a man that had taken the liberty of *stealing* himself. After being for 21 years in the condition of a slave, he escaped from it and reached the New England States. He was discovered by Garrison, thrust out into the field of anti-slavery, and in that field he had been one of the most devoted and most successful labourers that had ever entered it. To him they owed the revival of that feeling in this country. He had been in almost every city of Ireland and Scotland, he had addressed numerous audiences in England, and was now there to address the people of Liverpool. He knew they would give him such a reception as would strike terror to the heart of the man who dared to call him his, and assume a right to the possession of his fellow-creature. He had no doubt they would shout him a welcome to the free soil of England, and a welcome to the town of Liverpool. (Cheers.) He too had been assailed by Dr. Cox, in a manner so brutal, that the worst enemy Dr. Cox had in the world could not wish him to do anything more to blast his reputation for ever in this country. And how had Frederick Douglas given offence to these rev. gentleman, these liberty-loving, these very speech-loving American Christians. They came over to a temperance convention held in London in August last. One of their meeting was a large one held at Covent Garden Theatre. Mr. Douglas was invited to that meeting; he attended it, he was called upon to ad-

dress that large audience, and during his remarks he stated—upon a platform crowded by hundreds of the most distinguished philanthropists of the age, and surrounded by an audience who gave him a most cordial greeting—that in no part of the United States, not even on the soil of the Pilgrim Fathers, was a coloured man permitted to stand upon a platform with a white man. Did he do wrong or right in stating that fact? (Cries of "right," and cheers.) You say he did right; but he added more to his offence—he stated that while they—these ministers of religion—had made the strongest exertions for reclaiming the white population of the United States from the demoralizing effects of intoxicating drinks, they had utterly neglected the condition of three millions of their black countrymen; they had done nothing in the way of inculcating habits of temperance among them—and those reverend gentlemen did not then attempt to deny that fact. He did even more—he said that the coloured population, instead of being encouraged to practice temperance—to practise the means of ennobling themselves,—had, when upon one occasion they formed a procession for the purpose of commencing the good work for themselves, been set upon by a ruthless mob, and the temperance hall which they had erected was finally destroyed by fire. That fact he stated; and conjured the ministers then upon the platform, not to forget when they went home, that there was a coloured population both in the north and south of the United States, that demanded their sympathy and called for their impartial exertions. Mr. Thompson then read a letter sent, immediately after that meeting, by Dr. Cox, to the *New York Evangelist*, and which was published in that paper, and had since arrived in this country, which stated that the moral effect produced by that temperance meeting was superb and glorious, until Frederick Douglas appeared upon the platform, and spoke in so *a-la-mode* a manner as to ruin the good influence of all the observations that had been previously made. Frederick Douglas (said Mr. T.) must have been a most extraordinary man to destroy in ten minutes the effect of all that had been previously uttered by some of the most talented men of this country, and the reverend delegates from the United States to boot. Mr. Thompson, after reading the whole of Dr. Cox's letter, and most severely commenting upon it, said, the Doctor was the same man now as he knew him to be when he first saw him in 1833. The first words he heard him utter were addressed to him (Mr. T.) in this manner:—"Well, sir, it is 1833; and so you are going to teach my countrymen. And do you think you are able to tell my countrymen anything that will enable them to improve their institutions?" He (Mr. T.) might have said that he thought he was; but he was more modest and said, merely, that he was going to help Mr. Garrison, in the United States. The Dr. said, "Well, I suppose you are going to preach the doctrine of amalgamation." "What is that?" "Oh, that we should marry all our daughters to negroes." His (Mr. Thompson's) reply was, that he considered that quite a matter of taste, with which he could have nothing to do (laughter and cheers). He was going to preach the doctrine, that slave-holding was a crime in the sight of God—that immediate emancipation was the duty of the slave master, and the right of the slave—that no man ever could possess a right of property in any human being. "Oh, but," said he, "the people on the other side of the Atlantic preach the doctrine of amalgamation," and then he added—"I would sooner stand by the bed side of my daughter and see her expire, then follow her to the grave and see the earth close over her, than see her married to a coloured man." These words (said Mr. T.) were uttered in the drawing-room of the Rev. Henry Grey, in the city of Edinburgh, in the year 1833. That was the state of the doctor's mind then, and if he had ever been washed since that time, he had returned like a certain obscene animal, to his wallowing in the mire. (Cheers.)

In his letter, before-named, Dr. Cox, speaking of the manner in which Frederick Douglas, at that meeting at Covent Garden Theatre, launched his missiles against the United States, further said "that the man had been flattered, and used, and petted by certain abolitionists, not unknown to him (Dr. Cox), until he had forgotten himself." Now he (Mr. Thompson) would then declare, in the presence of his maker, that such an insinuation was a wilful falsehood, and that such an allegation had no foundation whatever in truth. He had said this at Manchester, where Dr. Cox had many friends, but none of them had dared to come forward in his defence. Was there any one of his friends in Liverpool who would stand forward in defence of the man whom he (Mr. T.) had charged with uttering that which was false, and which he must have known to be false (cheers)? Frederick Douglas had never been paid by the abolitionists of this country; he had lived by the fruits of his own pen; and as to his ever being misled, or yielding to the promptings of others, there was no necessity for that. He was prompted by his own heart, and did best when, following the teachings of that heart, he represented the wrongs of his sisters, his brothers, and three millions of countrymen; whom he left in bondage. (Hear.) Dr. Cox further said in that letter, "that he came to this country the sympathising friend of Frederick Douglas, but that he was so no longer." Weep Frederick (said Mr. T., turning in the most mock heroic manner to Mr. Douglas), the doctor sympathises with you no longer. It reminded him of a pleasant anecdote told of a Mr. Hoby, a boot-maker, in London, who, having made a first pair of boots for a fastidious young gentleman which did not exactly fit, was waited upon the following day by his new customer, and very pompously told of the fact. Mr. Hoby expressed his desire to have them returned, and he would make another pair. "No, sir," said the gentleman, "I am come to inform you I shall never give you another order." "John," said Mr. Hoby, "put up the shutters." "Why, sir," said the shop-boy, "the sun is shining, why should I put them up?" "This young gentleman," said Mr. Hoby, "says he will give me no more orders." (Great laughter.) So it was with Frederick Douglas. He might now go home, for Dr. Cox could sympathise with him no longer. Mr. Thompson dwelt at still greater length upon the conduct of Dr. Cox, and the American Evangelical delegates, in so strenously opposing the anti-slavery principles of such men as Garrison, Douglas, and others, in this country, and concluded his address by observing that he had been brought acquainted with the character and standing of those men, and he would repeat that, with the exception of three or four of them, the rest were practically the enemies of the cause of emancipation in the United States. (The chairman resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.)

Mr. F. Douglas then rose and said, that whatever might be the opinion of the people of this country as to the propriety of white men and free men speaking out against American slavery, there must be but one opinion as to the right of black men and slaves to speak out against it. (Hear, hear.) He was aware, however, that there was in all communities in England an objection—seemingly quite a rational one—against the discussion of American slavery in this country at all. There were those who really believed that to discuss this question in this country was to do the cause of emancipation in the United States a serious injury. He believed that there were a large number of good persons in this country who were restrained from connecting themselves with the anti-slavery agitation in consequence of a conviction that all their efforts in this country for such a purpose would be injurious to the cause of the slave. He nevertheless believed their hearts to be sound in the cause, and that they only wanted to have their objections removed, when they would be willing to co-operate for the overthrow of negro slavery. Slavery was so monstrous an iniquity, so corrupting to the human heart, so blunting to the

moral senses, so potent in begetting a character in all around it—both on the part of the slave and the slave-holder—favourable to its own continuance. Slavery in the United States had blasted and destroyed the moral sense of the people. There was not left among them moral stamina enough to cope with that gigantic crime. It had so sapped the religious institutions of the country as almost to render the nation devoid of shame. They seemed not to be able to detect the inconsistency in which slave-holding involved them. They set out in their Charter of National Independence, that they held these truths as self-evident—"that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And yet what was the commentary upon that declaration? That three millions of slaves—one-sixth of the entire population of the United States—were that night in chains, in fetters; stripped of their rights; herded together like brutes; without the institution of marriage amongst them; without the Bible; driven from time to eternity in the dark, before the biting lash of their tyrannical slave-drivers. And this horrid crime was sanctioned and sanctified—sanctioned by the law, and sanctified by the religion of America. There was no such thing left as a national heart to which a successful appeal might be made against it. He was, however, disposed to think that the work of abolition in the United States was to be carried on mainly by the people of this country. The people of both countries spoke the same language, read the same literature, adhered to the same religious creed, believed in the same God, and professed to be followers of the same Christ. The words spoken in Liverpool that day might be heard two weeks hence in Boston. The denunciations of slavery uttered within this week at Exeter Hall might be heard in ten days among the hills of New England; and every word uttered in this country might be heard in a short time on the other side of the Atlantic. He knew that the Americans railled against England because she dared to speak out her honest convictions to the slave-holders of America; but was England not to speak because they railled against her? because her remarks touched the consciences of the American slaveholders? England was engaged in sending missionaries and bibles to the heathen in every land; why not send them to the slaves of America who were treated as heathens? The people of America would never be brought to a sense of their degradation until they had become a by-word among the people of all Christian nations. He believed that by speaking to America from this side of the Atlantic they were doing more good than if they spoke to her in the immediate vicinity of slavery. Were he on his native soil that night he should not be able to meet with the sympathy and support of an audience; he would be mobbed as he had been—mobbed for daring to express his wrongs; for daring to show the scars on his back; for daring to tell them that he had four sisters and a brother still in slavery. For doing this he had been mobbed, beaten, stoned, and had had his right hand broken in Christian America; but in this country he could stand up and state his wrongs, receive the sympathies—(tremendous cheers)—of a British audience; and have his denunciations of American slavery and slave-holders borne across the Atlantic, attended with the shouts of British Christians. (Cheers.) But let it not be supposed that he was there for the purpose of stirring up anger against the United States. He had never done any such thing. He had always met too lively an indignation in the people of this country against slavery; and his only object was to enlist the christian, moral, and religious influences of the world against it. It was by such means that he and those with him expected to put down slavery in America. They did not seek to put it down by physical force; their instrumentalities were such only as were sanctioned by the doctrines of Christianity, and such only as good men of all countries could commend. The people of America might be able to drive the armies of England from their shores, should they go there, but there was an influence which might be exerted that they could not meet or overthrow—it was the power of truth, the power of love, the power of the pulpit, and the power of the press. One Englishman standing up thoughtfully on this or the other side of the Atlantic, and proclaiming to the American clergy, and to the American slave holders, his abhorence of their crime, would do more to alarm their consciences and to disturb the American people than all the threats of war which might be uttered against them. They could not resist this; they would see the cancer that was eating into their vitals, and that all their vaunted independence was a lie. (Cheers.) They would see that their 4th of July orations were regarded on this side of the Atlantic as downright absurdities; they would see that all their pretensions to a love of God, while they hated the slave, was regarded as an absolute profanity; they would see that their boast of sending the Gospel to the heathen, while they withheld it from their slaves, was all marked down here as utter blasphemy. When they saw that they would not be able to lift up their heads among Christian nations, in consequence of the continuance of slavery, then they would abolish it. If the hypocrisy of the American Church was fully known to British Christians, they would as soon think of linking themselves to a pirate ship as to that church. But he would not yet believe that these men (the American delegates) had succeeded in separating the abolitionists of this country from the abolitionists of the United States, but that the churches of this country were yet prepared to say that they would have no union with slave holders. (Cheers.) But what was slavery in the United States? He ought to have answered this question before. It was the enforcement of the right of one man in the body and soul of another man. He had known it experimentally. In the Providence of God he had been able to break his chain, escape from the prisonhouse, and land on British soil. He was glad to be here, where no hired slave-driver could lash him with a cat-o'-nine-tails, but where he could be free. He felt glad to-night to imbibe British air, particularly as he understood that his master had sworn by his Maker to reduce him again to slavery, if ever he found him in America. This oath reminded him of Mrs. Glass's celebrated receipt about cooking a hare, when she said—"first catch your hare." The slaves were not allowed to read, and in Louisiana it was death to teach the slave to spell the name of the Deity. There were seventy-two crimes in the state of Virginia for which a black man was punishable with death, and there were only two of these for which a white man was punishable with death; and yet of the nature of these laws the negroes were ignorant. A slave might be killed or hanged, and he might be divided into quarters, for striking his master. So many lashes were inflicted for a slave being off his particular plantation. Branding was also employed. He had seen his own cousin, a female, lashed upon the bare back, and while this flogging was being inflicted, the person who lashed her and who was a methodist class leader, quoted this part of Scripture—"He that knoweth his master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." (Cries of "Shame.") His (Mr. Douglas's) back had been scarred and those scars he should carry with him to the grave. He had seen a woman's ear nailed to a pump, and he had seen that female tear away from the pump, and leave her ear nailed behind her. He then went on to say that man-stealing was still going on in full vigour. He had seen droves of human beings driven off like cattle, and sold upon the auction blocks. He had seen husbands torn from wives, children from parents, and they were sold in lots. Not long since a married female was sold in the usual auction manner—"here is a fine negro—give us a bid—she is sound in wind and limb." She was sold, and then the

husband was refused permission to take a last farewell of his wife. These things were done, and in the capital too, in the capital of the land of the brave, and the home of the free, as it was called. And who were responsible for this? The clergy of the churches of the land were responsible. They had the creating and moulding of public opinion in their hands. They could will the destruction or perpetuity of slavery, and they had willed its perpetuity. The American Methodists held 250,000 slaves, the Baptists 90,000 slaves, and so on. Babes were sold to send Bibles to the heathen. The slave prison and the church in the same street. The pulpit and the auction block were close together. The auction sale supported and the pulpits covered over the base traffic with the name of Christianity. Ministers of religion defend slavery from the Bible, and grave Doctors of Divinity and Bishops traded in human flesh. The churches were stained with it. Men were sold to support sacramental observances, and it was with men of this kind that the Evangelical Alliance wanted to link themselves. ("They won't.") He was glad to hear that; he hoped they would not do anything to link themselves with the slaveholder—but hitherto the Evangelical Alliance had not done well. He appealed to any American present as to whether he had told the truth. [Here a man of colour, from the southern States, rose in the body of the meeting, and said—"Yes, I can testify that you have spoken the truth."] (Applause.) Mr. Douglas found it impossible to exaggerate the state of things in the southern States. He then told the audience what a slaveholder's sermon was; and he said that invariably those sermons were delivered in a pious and sanctimonious tone. They had one text, for there were very few texts in the Bible that suited them. They generally preached from this text, "Servants obey your masters," assuming, of course, that servants were slaves. "You should be obedient," the slaveholder goes on to say. You ask how you should be obedient, and the answer is given in the text, "Obey your masters." He then went on at some length, giving the different heads of the sermons preached to the slaves, and in his imitations of the nasal twang of the preachers, and of the substance of the sermons, convulsed the audience with laughter. He then referred to two sermons recently preached by Bishop Meade, and intended for general circulation; and this led him to allude again to the fact that the Bible was excluded from the slaves, and to state that a letter was written by this very Bishop Meade to Dr. Bunting, which was read at the late conference meetings of the Evangelical Alliance in London. He read extracts from Bishop Meade's sermons, after which he said the fires of insurrection would have long since lighted up the whole of the Southern States of America had it not been for the efforts of Mr. Lloyd Garrison. It was because Mr. Garrison had denounced the religion of Bishop Meade he had been designated an infidel, but it was the grossest of all frauds and libels to call such a religion as this Christianity. To advocate such a religion as this was to war with that religion which is first pure—then peaceable; and by all the love he bore to Christianity he was bound to denounce the slaveholding religion of America, and the man who would advocate it was at war with God. Doctor Cox applied for a slaveholder to become a member of the Alliance, and he was refused; whereat the Doctor said that the exclusion of that man would wound the heart of many in America. It was to be expected that those who had allied themselves to the slave-holder would array themselves against the slave and the abolitionist. He acknowledged that he was an infidel to the slave-holding religion of America. He knew he would awake the ire of Dr. Cox and the American churches; but he cared not. He should go through England, Ireland, and Scotland, again to startle the slave-holders of America. People needed information on this subject. They required to know something of Dr. Cox and the other members of the American deputation. They required also to know something of American professions. Americans professed to be anxious for the cause of Christ. 'Twas a lie. Thrice had the Bible Society refused to give the Bible to the slaves in the Southern States, and therefore they were hypocrites. He admitted that there were true Christians in America. From ten thousand pulpits prayers were offered up every Sunday, thanking God that the people lived in a land of civil and religious liberty. 'Twas a lie! How could it be a land of civil and religious liberty where there were three millions of slaves, and where, if a man denied the institution of slavery, it was punishable with death. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN alluded to an article in the *Christian Witness*, with reference to the decline of religion in the slave-holding States; and in reply to a question from the meeting, he read the title of Bishop Meade's Sermons. He announced that the life of Frederick Douglas would be on sale at the close of the meeting. Price 2s. 6d. per copy, with an engraved portrait. He also announced that subscriptions would be received in boxes held at the door, to defray the expenses of holding the present meeting.

The Rev. JOSHUA B. HINDS, of Boston, N.S., was the next speaker. He was acquainted with the matter of facts to which the Chairman had referred, and he had no means of defending the men from the charges preferred against them. The men were respected; but truth was great and it must prevail. He felt a deep interest in the cause of Christianity, but he could not sympathise with a Christianity which took the Bible from his fellow-beings, and denied them the rights of marriage. Therefore, if the Chairman, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Garrison were infidels, he was an infidel; and when he read Dr. Cox's statement in the papers, he was wounded—wounded, because of the injury it must do to Dr. Cox and the cause of Christianity. He was present at the Great Temperance Convention in London, and heard Mr. Douglas address the meeting; and he was glad to say that by that meeting Mr. Douglas was most warmly received. Many of the American men attending the alliance will have to go to Philadelphia next spring, and to sing and pray with slave holders. Some of the deputation educated the sons of slave-holders; others were min isters in slave-holding states; and had these men voted against slavery at the Conference, they would have been lynched when they returned to their own country. Bishop Meade's letter was received by the Rev. Dr, Bickersteth; and that letter was to the effect that the Americans were willing to surrender their slaves, but that they couldn't. Now, he (Mr. Hinds) knew better. Why not send the slave to the Canadas, if they were so anxious to get r of them? (Hear, hear.) There was a grand object to be achieved by the ministers on both sides of the Atlantic to found the Evangelical Alliance. At first, the English ministers of religion were to a man against slavery. But then the American ministers made their appearance, and a better deputation could not have been selected to defend slavery. When the conference met, one minister yielded, another yielded, and a third yielded. They said, it would not do to break up the alliance, for to reject the American brethren, with their slave-holding principles, would be to destroy the alliance. The corrupting and damning principles of slavery never committed greater havoc and destruction than during the twenty-four-hours' conference of the Alliance; and as the Alliance could not do anything right on the subject, he (Mr. Hinds) was glad that the Alliance did not do anything at all. (Applause.) But he told them at the time that the subject was not at an end, but that the people would take it up throughout the country. Since then, he, like Mr. Garrison, had been maligned.

The CHAIRMAN then passed a glowing eulogium upon Mr. Garrison. He called him "the Clarkson of America," and said that he had for years conducted the *Liberator* newspaper in that country—an out-and-out advocate of the slave; and he indignantly denied that Mr. Garrison was, as he had been accused of being—an infidel!

Mr. Garrison, on rising, was received with immense applause. He could not, at that late hour, ½ to 10, detain them with any observations on American slavery. They had already heard Mr. Douglas—a man who had been sold as a block; and upon the subject of slavery, after him, nothing could be added. He (Mr. G.) would give way for a gentleman who would speak on the Evangelical Alliance. They should remember what a great deal slavery had to do with British wrecks. They all knew that a treaty existed, under which Britains had a right to travel through America; but the moment a British coloured man arrived he was imprisoned, which imprisonment must be paid for, and if not paid for, the individual must be carried to the auction block and sold into interminable slavery. He then stated that the slave laws of America stirred up war against England. He wanted not to arouse a spirit of war in England, but he was desirous that England should make a stand against such an injurious effect of the slave laws as he had described. The rights of Englishmen were, therefore, at stake, and Parliament should be called upon to see whether these things were so. Let a demand be made for the repeal of these laws; and he was happy to say that, in despite of the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church of Scotland, the cause of abolition was progressing in the British Empire. He cared nothing for attacks on his character while he had a good conscience. The slaves loved him; the slaveholders hated him, and a price had for a long time been laid upon his head. Aspersions coming from those who justified slavery from the Bible, and yet withheld the Bible from the slaves, was valueless in his estimation. What crime had he not denounced? Until America cast off slavery, she was practically an atheistical nation. He concluded with a passage from Cowper, denunciatory of slavery.

Upon the motion of the Rev. Mr. Clare the following resolution was put, and caaried unanimously:—

"That the conduct of the Free Church of Scotland, in taking the money of slaveholders, and in return extending to them the sanction of full communion with that body, and that of the Evangelical Alliance Conference, recently assembled in London—first, in adopting a proposition declaring that men might be shareholders without any fault of their own, and from disinterested motives; and then, to gratify the pro-slavery spirit of the American delegates, erasing from their proceedings all reference to the subject of slavery in order to prevent a disunion, evinced in both cases an utter disregard of the corresponding spirit of Christianity, and was a virtual approval of the acts of those who, while they profess to be the followers of the great Redeemer, [illegible] merchandise of the bodies and souls of men."

A vote of thanks to the Chairman was then passed, and the meeting separated at eleven o'clock.

Nonconformist Oct. 21/46

American Slavery.—We learn that Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, yielding to the solicitations of his friends, has consented to remain in this country until the sailing of the Cambria, on the 4th November. We have seen a list of the engagements of Mr. Garrison, who is to be accompanied by Mr. George Thompson, by which it appears that meetings on Slavery and the Evangelical Alliance are to be held in many of our principal towns between this date and the sailing of Mr. Garrison. At the meeting in Manchester, on Monday last, it is estimated 4,000 persons were present; and we observe the days fixed for Edinburgh, are October 20th and 21st; Dundee, 23d; Perth, 24th; Aberdeen or Inverness, 26th; and Glasgow the 28th.—*Glasgow Argus.*

THE ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE AND THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

MEETING AT AYLESBURY.

A meeting of the Evangelical Alliance was held a short time ago at Aylesbury, at which certain questions were put to the Chairman by Messrs. Gibbs and Hamilton, with reference to the exclusion of Quakers, and other professors of religion, and the inclusion of slaveholders within the pale of the Alliance. The answers to those questions not being deemed satisfactory, and the chairman positively prohibiting anything in the shape of discussion, an announcement was thereupon made to the meeting by Mr. Hamilton, that a public meeting would be held in a few days, in the same place, to review the proceedings of the Alliance, and to take the sense of the people of Aylesbury, after the fullest discussion respecting the conduct of the 1,200 ministers and professors of religion, upon the important question of American slavery. In pursuance of the announcement then made, a public meeting was held on Thursday evening last, in the same place in which the Alliance held its meeting—the Town-hall—which was filled with a most respectable auditory, including several of the most talented ministers of the neighbourhood, and most of the influential members of the various religious denominations in the locality. Among the gentlemen upon the platform were, Dr. Lee, of Hartwell; Messrs. Conder, of High Wycombe; Wycherley, of Tring; Green, of High Wycombe; Doxey, of Thame; Stalybrass, of Chesham; Terry, of Long Crendon, ministers; and Messrs. Gibbs, Hamilton, Gibbs, jun., Payne, &c., &c. The large hall was well filled, and the galleries were crowded.

Dr. Lee, having been called to the chair, briefly explained the origin and object of the meeting.

Mr. Wycherly, of Tring, minister, followed. He felt it to be his duty to say at the commencement that the Anti-slavery League was not opposed to an evangelical alliance [hear, hear]—nay, more, that many of its members and friends admire Christian union, seek it, and pray that it may be found existing, not only in the holiday attire of public life, but in all the connexions of religious life. That the Evangelical Alliance was not with them was not their fault. He went on at some length to defend the *Patriot* against the aspersions of Sir C. E. Smith, and concluded by moving—

That the meeting regard American slavery as a sin demanding the condemnation of every human being who respects the law of God, and recognises the principles of national justice and the equal rights of man.

Mr. John Gibbs seconded the motion in a long speech. He stated, that he highly approved of the professed objects of the Alliance; and, if peace and unity among Christians could be procured at any consistent price, he would at once join hand in hand in getting rid of that sectarian feeling which was the curse of English society; but he could not understand how a man who had endeavoured to compel the Dissenters, against their consciences, to pay for the dilapidations of the Church, could turn round and say, "Dear brother, we must make an Evangelical Alliance" [hear]. If any man was desirous of real Christian union, let him first of all aid in the removal of those causes which lead to its impediment. There were several members of the Alliance who were also acting with him (Mr. Gibbs) as members of the Anti-state-church Society; but the latter was an aggressive society, declaring war against an existing evil, while the other might be called an Evangelical Principle-compromising Company [loud laughter].

The resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

Mr. George Thompson was then announced, and, on presenting himself to the meeting, was greeted with loud applause. He spoke for upwards of two hours in support of a resolution, strongly condemnatory of the conduct of the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of slavery:—

He commenced by expressing his delight on finding himself in Aylesbury. At a former meeting in the County-hall, the audience had been told, by the Rev. Mr. Adey, that the Evangelical Alliance was not the Anti-slavery Society [laughter]—a piece of information quite superfluous, after the declaration of the hon. baronet in the chair, that he would sooner renounce the Alliance, than give up the fellowship he enjoyed with a Christian Brazilian-mining slaveholder [laughter]. He (Mr. Thompson) begged to inform his friends around him, that the Anti-slavery League, with which he was connected, was not the Evangelical Alliance [cheers]. It was a mistake, however, to say that there *was* an Evangelical Alliance. There was no such body, technically considered. But there was an alliance which no opposition on earth, or from beneath, could successfully assail [hear]. It was the union, vital and indissoluble, of all of every name who had, by faith, embraced Christ. Their union was as close, compact, and intimate, as that of the stones of a building, or as that of the connexion between the branches and the stem of the vine. The members of this Alliance were not thus united, in consequence of any meeting in Freemasons'-hall; yet they were one. Yes, whether the follower and true disciple of Christ was in the log cabin of the American prairie, or the burning sands of Egypt—on the plains of Hindostan, or in the peaceful vales of England, he was a member of that glorious Alliance of which Christ, and not Sir Culling Eardley Smith, was the head [cheers]. Having named the President of the late Conference, he wished to say, that he held the piety and benevolence of that estimable gentleman in the highest respect; but, at the same time, would take the liberty of saying, that the speech of that excellent person on the question of slavery, which he had made in that hall on the 29th of September, was a disgrace to a man professing to understand the genius of the Gospel and the requirements of the immutable and universal law of God [cheers]. Sir Culling would have to retract the horrid doctrine he had (he, Mr. Thompson, hoped, hastily,) promulgated—that one of the most pious and Christian men in London was a holder of slaves. This was a gross libel upon every other member of that body. To assume a right of property in one of God's immortal, accountable, and blood-redeemed creatures, was to dethrone the Deity: and, to send Christianity to the victim of so impious and atheistical an act, was to teach the slave that the man who asserted a right of property in him, was a man who had usurped the prerogative of Jehovah, and had trampled upon the unchangeable moral principles which were the foundation of human liberty, and the safeguard of human happiness [cheers]. Mr. Thompson then proceeded to give a detailed history of the doings of the Conference from the morning of the 28th of August till the evening of the 2nd of September, and solemnly denounced the conduct of the 1,200 men who had deliberately refused (after four days' uninterrupted consideration of the subject) to record any condemnation of the unutterable crime of man-stealing. Mr. Thompson then referred to the history of several of the members of the Alliance, particularly of Dr. Olin, Dr. Patton, Dr. Smythe, Mr. Morse, and Dr. Cox. In reference to the last-named gentleman Mr. Thompson observed, that there had appeared in the columns of the *Patriot* of the 12th (a paper which had laid the anti-slavery public of the country under the deepest obligations, by its calm, yet fearless, vindication of sound abolition principles)—[cheers]—a letter written by Dr. Cox to the *New York Evangelist*. The bitterest enemy of Dr. Cox could not have desired that person to do anything more calculated to blast for ever his reputation as a minister of Christ. The spirit of the letter was absolutely fiendish. It appeared to have been written by a man utterly lost to all sense of decency, truth, and common sense. The wickedness of that letter was only equalled by the unexampled folly that had led to the penning of an epistle, which would do more to sink the writer to the lowest depths of degradation, than any aspersions or accusations that could emanate from any other quarter. Mr. Thompson then read the letter, which was heard amid manifestations of the most profound horror and disgust by the entire audience. He also pronounced a high eulogy on the character of Frederick Douglass, whom he declared incapable of the meanness, subserviency, and cupidity, ascribed to him by Dr. Cox. Before concluding, Mr. Thompson inquired if the Rev. Alexander Digby Campbell, of Aylesbury, was present, as that gentleman had arrived in the town by the same train with himself. There being no response, Mr. Thompson observed that the absence of that gentleman was a significant fact. It argued either a want of honesty or a want of courage [hear, hear]. That gentleman was one of the secretaries of the Conference. If the Conference had done right, he should be there to defend it—if wrong, it was his duty to withdraw from it [cheers]. It was singular that no conspicuous member of the Alliance had dared to appear publicly in defence of that body, unless the letter of his reverend and beloved friend Dr. Wardlaw [hear] was to be considered a defence. He (Mr. Thompson) sincerely regretted that so good and great a man as Dr. Wardlaw had guaranteed the anti-slavery character of the Americans; for he (Mr. Thompson) would undertake to prove in Glasgow that, with a few noble exceptions, the American delegates were among the bitter and unrelenting persecutors of the only true and faithful abolitionists of the United States. He knew Dr. Wardlaw well—enough, however, to feel assured that he had only to be made aware of the fact to be induced to break off communication with such men, and declare himself on the side of the uncompromising friends of the truth.

Mr. Conder, of Tring, minister, seconded the resolution in a brief speech.

Mr. Henry Clapp, of Lynn, Massachusetts, supported the motion. He eulogised Frederick Douglass, who, although a self-educated man, was great in intellect and powerful in speech, so much so, that there was not one of the most gifted of all the scholars and writers of New England who was not proud to listen to him. He (Mr. Clapp) had witnessed large assemblies gathered together in old Faneuil Hall, bestowing hour after hour, without taking the least note of time, to the words of the fugitive slave, Frederick Douglass. He related some interesting facts relative to the Anti-slavery agitation in America:—

He (Mr. Clapp) well recollected Mr. George Thompson in America; for that gentleman had, upon one occasion, given him (Mr. Clapp) a sound whipping. He went to the Anti-slavery meeting, as a young man, to hear George Thompson, "the infidel" and "the Britisher," who had come over to America to interfere with their peculiar institutions. Mr. Thompson, however, inflicted such a castigation upon him that, although Mr. Thompson had forgotten it, he (Mr. Clapp) still retained a tingling recollection of the occurrence [laughter]. Mr. Thompson remained in America, fighting the battle of abolition as long as it was at all safe for him to do so, and, had he not left the country when he did, most certainly he would have been honoured with a martyr's grave [hear]. A furious crowd assembled in Boston; and, had they succeeded in finding George Thompson, beyond all question, they would instantly have killed him as dead as Julius Cæsar [laughter]. They, however, did find William Lloyd Garrison, put a rope round his neck, led him through the streets, and, unless he had been rescued by several Truckmen, aided by other friends, they would have sacrificed his life. As it was, there was no place in Boston strong enough to protect the devoted abolitionist from the fury of the pro-slavery mob, except the city gaol, were Mr Garrison was consigned for the

night [cries of "Shame"]. When the delegation to the Evangelical Alliance went back to America, the report of their proceedings here would infuse joy in the breasts of every slaveholder, and fill the hearts of the abolitionists with sorrow. The American abolitionists, however, were not deceived, for they had always a belief that the deputation would "dodge" the slavery question [hear].

Mr. G. Thompson then asked Mr. Clapp fearlessly, whether the American delegation to the Alliance were known in their own country in the character they wished to sustain here as slavery-abolitionists? He wished to have the testimony of Mr. Clapp upon that point, because that gentleman was an American.

Mr. Clapp replied, that, as an American abolitionist of some years' standing and the editor of an anti-slavery newspaper, he begged to say that Dr. Cox and his colleagues were not known at all in America as friends of the anti-slavery cause, and that, if they were to present themselves at an anti-slavery meeting, it would cause as much surprise as though the Bishop of London, the Lord Mayor, and a score of aldermen were to present themselves to take the pledge at a teetotal temperance meeting [laughter].

Various other ministers and gentlemen, including Messrs. Doxsey of Thame, S. G. Green of High Wycombe, Stallybrass, and Hamilton, took part in the meeting, and a vote of thanks to Messrs. G. Thompson, W. L. Garrison, F. Douglass, H. Clapp, and the members of the Anti-slavery League, for the noble stand they had made against the pro-slavery proceedings of the Alliance, was carried with acclamation.

MEETING AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

On Friday evening, at seven o'clock, a public meeting was held in the Nelson-street lecture-room, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, "to receive William Lloyd Garrison, of Boston, Massachusets, Editor of the *Liberator*," and to hear from him "a lecture on Slavery, as existing in the United States." The immense room was densely crowded, and hundreds were unable to obtain admission. Among the gentlemen present were the Right Worshipful the Mayor, Messrs. L. Paige, H. W. Wright, Wight, G. Bell, and George Harris, ministers, Captain J. D. Weatherley, and Messrs. T. M. Greenhow, J. L. Angas, M. Forster, E. Richardson, R. Grainger, W. Beaumont, Joseph Watson, R. W. Swan, Charles Larkin, Joshua Watson (sen. and jun.), E. S. Hills, D. H. Wilson, T. I. Proctor, J. Mawson, T. Wilcke, &c., &c.

A condensed report of the proceedings is given in the *Newcastle Guardian* and *Gateshead Observer*, to which journals we are indebted for the following account.

When Mr. Garrison entered the room he was received with a loud and heartfelt burst of cheering from the vast assemblage. [He was unaccompanied by Mr. Thompson, that gentleman not having then arrived in Newcastle. He had been, on the previous evening, at a public meeting in Aylesbury; but from Buckinghamshire to Northumberland is less than a day's journey in these railway times, and we may anticipate the order of the proceedings so far as to state that he reached the Nelson-street lecture-room shortly after Mr. Garrison. The audience, who had feared lest he might not arrive, were rejoiced to see him, and gave him an enthusiastic welcome.]

On the motion of T. M. Greenhow, Esq., seconded by everybody present,

The Mayor, T. E. Headlam, Esq., M.D., took the chair. His worship, in briefly opening the business of the meeting, spoke of Mr. Garrison as a most distinguished citizen of America—an ardent friend of the abolition of negro slavery—a zealous and devoted advocate of the sacred caus[illegible]y, h[illegible]y, [illegible] justice [loud cheers].

Mr. George Harris, minister, having been called upon by the Mayor, rose amidst loud cheers, and, when silence was restored, moved and eloquently supported the following resolution:—

That deploring the existence of slavery in any nation, as a wrong to human nature, and a violation of the Christian law of brotherhood and love, and more especially deploring its continuance in a country whose Declaration of Independence bears attestation to the glorious principles "that all men are created equal," and with "certain inalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," this meeting welcomes the brave, intrepid, and consistent champion of the rights of man, William Lloyd Garrison, and his able and indefatigable fellow-labourer, George Thompson, and wish them God speed in their righteous, benevolent, and Christian efforts, in breaking every yoke, and bidding the oppressed go free [loud cheers].

R. W. Swan, Esq., seconded the resolution, and it was unanimously adopted by the meeting.

Mr. Garrison rose to reply. Some time elapsed, however, before he could begin, so protracted was the cheering. After a few preliminary observations, he said he desired to be at home with them on this question. How could he look on three millions of his own countrymen in chains, registered as so much property, ranked among four-footed beasts, and not lift his voice against their enslavement? How could he look on, believing in Christianity, and see three millions of his countrymen deprived of the gospel, and not vindicate their rights as human beings, and demand that the gospel of Christ be preached unto them? How could he see them without the Bible, believing that book able to make "wise unto salvation," and not raise his voice against the impiety of those who were taking the Bible away from them, and who made it a penal offence to learn to read. He had been simply human on the other side of the Atlantic, and his only merit was, that he had not been a cowardly or unprincipled man, but had endeavoured to remember those in bonds as if in bonds with them himself, and "the head and front of his offending" had been to that extent, and no more. He had been called by great names in the United States. It was to him a matter of little consequence where a man might have been born. He was a member of one family, and a countrymen of theirs, though he did happen to be born on the other side of the Atlantic. Had not one God created them? Had they not one God and Father? And were they not all children of the same great family? He stood before them as the accredited representative of the coloured population of the United States—a population who were trodden underfoot—a population who had few to vindicate their rights, and who were given up to be destroyed by an unrelenting despotism. He had come to ask them for their sympathies in their behalf—to show them what were the obligations imposed upon them by God as moral and human beings, and as Englishmen, to endeavour to emancipate them, as they had gloriously emancipated their slaves in the West India colonies [loud cheers]. When they broke the chains of their own slaves, they only began the good work. He believed that, though the slaveholders and the apologists of slavery had called him by great names, they never had accused him of apologising for slavery. The condition of the free coloured population in the northern states had been a very deplorable one. They had been disgraced, despised, and trodden under foot, simply on account of the complexion which the Almighty had given them. It had been al-

most impossible for any of their number to obtain a knowledge of any trade, or to get into any of the schools with the white children, or to be recognised as human beings. Everywhere in the free states they had been a despised and injured population, and they were so now to a lamentable extent. Even in the house of God, a coloured man was excluded from equal rights, as though he were a wild beast or a loathsome reptile. The spirit of complexional cast was murderous with them, and many had been the victims who had fallen to it. He stood there to vindicate the free coloured population of North America as a remarkable population, for in spite of these prescriptions, they had risen in the scale of being, by their own energies, and were daily rising [applause]. The slave-apologist delegates, who came over to this country to the World's Convention, pleaded that they were not abettors of slavery, inasmuch as they came from the free states. In the city of New York, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, and the other northern states, they had no slaves; but what was the reason? Because the climate and soil were unfitted for the production of slaves. If New England, instead of being rough and rocky—if, instead of being in a comparatively cold climate, it had the soil and climate of the south, New England would at this hour be peopled with slaves, and he wanted Englishmen to understand how much liberty they were really enjoying, and how much hypocrisy too [hear]. Slavery was a national crime, and upheld by the free-will of the nation. He (Mr. Garrison) cared not where the American lived; let him be where he might, unless he was an abolitionist, he was a man-stealer, because he gave consent to the enslavement of his fellow-creatures [applause]. What did the Americans do, when they formed themselves into an independent nation? They agreed to a constitution which made slavery the law of the land, so that any man who supported the constitution of the United States must swear that he will also uphold slavery, and be its guard and defender. A more wicked and impious league never was conceived than that which framed the constitution of America, and he would denounce it as a covenant with death and an agreement with hell, and call for its immediate dissolution. In the district of Columbia, any man, for the sum of 400 dollars, might sell as many human beings as he pleased at the auction-block. Mr. Garrison then related an instance of a woman and child, who were seized by the city marshal on suspicion of being runaway slaves, and, after advertising them, and not finding the owner, offered them at the auction-block for sale, to pay, as it was termed, the expenses of the gaol [cries of "Shame"]. There was another law of Congress, by which a man might be put to death if he went to the coast of Africa to enslave the natives there. There was another law which empowered the city marshal to imprison American-born citizens suspected of being slaves; and, if it could not be proved that they were slaves, he might put them on the auction-block, and thereby make them slaves. If the law against the slave-trade were a just law, then, measuring the American people by that law, they were a nation of pirates, and ought to be doomed to death—if any pirate ever was [loud cheers]. Surely one human being was as good as another; and it must be as great a crime in the sight or God to enslave a native-born American as a native-born African. What was slavery in the United States? It was omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. It worked its own way as though it were a God. In controlled nearly all the religious denominations, and they did its bidding. Wherever the abolitionists went, they had to confront slavery. On the extremest point of the north-eastern boundary, as well as in Louisiana, the slave spirit was to be seen; it had come into every household, and taken hold of every American bosom; and he who would be a friend to the slave, must be prepared to be regarded as a disturber of the peace, who was not fit to be received into good society, and as one who had no religious character. Abolitionists were stigmatised as infidels in the United States, because they would not go on the side of slavery. America told France that, if she dared to send a coloured Frenchman he should be enslaved. She challenged the whole world, and attempted to subjugate the world. He was sorry to say that, in his tour throughout England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, he had found persons running to their Bibles to defend slavery as a bible institution, and had heard abolitionists calumniated by men claiming to be anti-slavery men. What was the cause of this? It was the Free Church of Scotland that had done it—a church that had struck hands with thieves and consented with adulterers—a church that was filling the air with aspersions against the American abolitionists, and apologising for American slave-holders. One evil step not being retraced, but persisted in, required a second, a third, and a fourth step. The cry of the Free Church of Scotland was downwards every year. He was sorry for it, as he was no enemy to the Free Church. When her delegates came over to America they were met kindly, by an anti-slavery appeal, beseeching them not to go into the slave states. But they would not listen to these remonstrances. They went to the south, and put a padlock on their lips, in regard to the enslavement of three millions of their fellow-creatures. They struck hands with the slave-holder—they recognised a man-stealing church, in which were man-stealing ministers. —There was another reason why such an unhappy state of things existed in America. A short time since, a body of delegates from various parts of the world, called the Evangelical Alliance, assembled in London. It claimed to be God-called, and combined the greatest amount of piety that the world could furnish. Their object, they said, was to preach Christianity to the world, and to fulfil the mission of Christ, who came to open the prison doors and set the captives free. In the course of their proceedings the subject of American slavery was introduced. They heard the clanking of the slave's chains—they knew the slave had no Bible—they knew he had no marriage institution—and, instead of lifting up their testimony against such a scheme of heathenism, what did they do? They refused to take any part in reference to those who had fallen amongst thieves. He stood there and charged such men as among the most deadly foes to emancipation in the world; and yet they have been trying to deceive them by pretending to be Abolitionists [hear]. After some other strictures on the Alliance, Mr. Garrison proceeded to remark on an article, reflecting on him, which appeared in the *Christian Witness*. The resolution which Dr. Campbell had inserted in that periodical was, he said, mutilated, and gave an erroneous impression of his (Mr. Garrison's) sentiments. But what, continued the speaker, is American religion? It is that which sanctifies slavery in the name of God, and pronounces it to be a Bible institution. After some other remarks in this strain, Mr. Garrison concluded by a touching allusion to the last hours of Clarkson, implor-

143 Nonconformist Oct. 2[illegible]6

ing the meeting to imbibe the spirit of that distinguished philanthropist, and to continue their exertions till slavery was entirely and for ever abolished.

Mr. Thompson, on presenting himself, was greeted with the most enthusiastic applause. His remarks were chiefly confined to the Evangelical Alliance, whose conduct, in reference to American slavery, was unsparingly reprobated. He stated that he appeared before them uninvited and unconnected with the Anti-slavery Society of this town; and he challenged the anonymous slanderer, whom he now saw before them, to come forward, if he dared, and substantiate the calumnies uttered against his friend Mr. Garrison [cries of "name"]. Mr. Thompson then proceeded, at considerable length, and with his characteristic ability, to criticise the proceedings of the Alliance. Dr. Cox he pronounced to be the greatest renegade and friend of the pro-slavery party in the United States. The conduct of the Free Church was the subject of Mr. Thompson's severe rebuke, as were also the letters sent by Dr. Cox from this country to his friends in America, some of which have been published. He concluded by asking what was the duty of the people of this country, under present circumstances? To rise up at the great call of nature, and check the progress of such pernicious principles. He and Mr. Garrison had travelled over various parts of the country, and everywhere the conduct of the Alliance had been condemned. It was their intention to travel still farther, and he had no doubt the same feeling would be found here and elsewhere.

Charles Larkin, Esq., rose, at the close of Mr. Thompson's address, and moved:—

That having listened with painful interest to the details of American slavery now made by William Lloyd Garrison and George Thompson, this meeting express their deep abhorrence of the flagitious wrongs and outrages inflicted on their negro brethren, and pledge continuous effort for the exposure of the great crime of slaveholding as existing in the United States, until the "accursed thing" shall root and branch be extirpated from the land.

In support of this resolution Mr. Larkin spoke briefly, but with his wonted eloquence and power, and was warmly applauded.

Joseph Watson, Esq., seconded Mr. Larkin's resolution; and, when put to the meeting by the Mayor, it was carried unanimously.

Mr. Garrison made grateful acknowledgments for himself and his friend, and moved a vote of thanks to the Mayor.

Mr. Thompson having seconded the motion, it was put to the meeting, and carried by acclamation.

The Mayor returned thanks, and said it had given him much satisfaction to attend the meeting, and give his sanction to the great and righteous cause which Mr. Garrison and Mr. Thompson had come to Newcastle to plead [loud cheers].

The meeting then broke up.

This morning (Saturday), Mr. Garrison and Mr. G. Thompson were entertained at breakfast, at Mr. Wilcke's, the Temperance hotel, Royal Arcade, Newcastle. At this meeting a branch of the Anti-slavery League was formed, and a great number of names were immediately enrolled, the greatest determination being expressed zealously and systematically to promote the funds, and forward the interests of that new organisation. Some regret was expressed at the unavoidable absence from the town of Mr. Pringle, minister, who, a short time since, seceded from the Alliance upon the slavery question, and whose presence at the meeting was fully anticipated. Messrs. Garrison and Thompson left for Liverpool, where a large public meeting was to be held on Monday evening.

MEETINGS AT GLASGOW.

Several important meetings have lately been held at Glasgow, under the auspices of the Emancipation Society of that city, attended by Messrs. Garrison and Douglass, with the object of reviewing the proceedings of the Free Church and Evangelical Alliance in relation to American slavery. The first was a meeting in the City-hall, which was numerously attended—A. Paton, Esq., in the chair; the second, a ladies' anti-slavery meeting. On the following evening there was a second meeting in the City-hall, and a public breakfast on the next morning at the Eagle Temperance-hotel. Amongst the resolutions adopted at these several meetings were the following:—

Whereas the Free Church of Scotland, in an evil hour, sent its delegates to the slaveholding states of America, to proffer the right hand of Christian fellowship to the polluted and oppressive churches in that land, and to receive their blood-stained money; and whereas, though more than two years had elapsed since that immoral act was consummated, and, notwithstanding the time allowed for repentance, and the light which has been shed upon the subject, that church still continues to justify its conduct, and to turn a deaf ear to the cries of down-trodden humanity; therefore—

Resolved,—That this meeting, in the name of the people of Scotland, solemnly renews its protest against the slaveholding position of the Free Church, and affectionately but earnestly implores that church, by its professed reverence for Christ as its Head, and a wise regard for its purity, prosperity, and its lasting honour, forthwith to dissolve its connection with the manstealing churches and ministers of the United States, and, in proof of the sincerity of their repentance, to SEND BACK THE MONEY.

Whereas the Evangelical Alliance, recently held in the City of London, composed of delegates from various parts of Christendom, professing to have formed that body "preeminently to please the Lord Jesus Christ," refused, at the bidding of the delegates from America, to testify against the enslavement of Three Millions of their fellow-men in that country, after their mournful and heathenish case was brought before them,—Therefore, resolved, that the burning rebuke and emphatic condemnation of the Christian world ought to fall on the so-called "Evangelical Alliance," as a body who proved treacherous to the cause of bleeding humanity; and, consequently, recreant to every principle of the religion of our compassionate Redeemer.

In one of his speeches Mr. Frederick Douglass made the following reference to the absence of some of the most celebrated anti-slavery advocates of Glasgow in former times:—

Not six years ago there were many in this city who did not hesitate to come forward and avow themselves the uncompromising advocates of emancipation, who were called Rev. Doctors of Divinity; and where are they now? They are among the missing. They have ceased to work with us: they have ceased to strike hands with the Abolitionists. This platform was once the arena of the eloquence of such persons as Dr. King, Dr. Wardlaw, Dr. Robson, and other eminent doctors of divinity in Glasgow. Where are they this evening? One of the slaves for whom they appeared to plead stands here this evening to ask after them [great applause]. Well do I remember how my heart throbbed with gratitude to those men when I read their speeches on the subject of emancipation. I remember how my heart was thrilled when I read the speeches of Dr. Wardlaw and those of George Thompson in relation to this subject. But where are they to-night? Where is Dr. King, Dr. Wardlaw, and Dr. Robson? Have the slaves in the United States given these gentlemen any offence? Have the slaves behaved in any manner to justify them in giving up the cause of abolition, and abandoning them to their tyrant masters [hear, hear]? I think not; but, if they have, these gentlemen should tell us what they have done to lead them to pass them by on the other side [cheers].

THE GLASGOW FREE PRESBYTERY AND THE SLAVERY QUESTION.—At the meeting of this body on Wednesday week, Dr. Willis, after a long and eloquent speech, submitted an overture condemning fellowship with slaveholders. He was supported by Mr. M'Beith, and opposed by Mr. Arnot, Mr. Lorimer, Dr. Buchanan, and Dr. Burns. The overture was rejected by twenty to five.

Patriot Oct. 22. 1846

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND SLAVERY.

GREAT PUBLIC MEETING AT NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

This important meeting, of which we gave a brief notice in our last Number, was held in the Nelson-street Lecture-room. Among the gentlemen present were the Right Worshipful, the Mayor, the Rev. L. Paige, the Rev. H. W. Wright, the Rev. Mr. Wight, the Rev. G. Bell, the Rev. George Harris, Captain J. D. Weatherley, and Messrs. T. M. Greenhow, J. L. Angas, M. Forster, E. Richardson, R. Grainger, W. Beaumont, Joseph Watson, R. W. Swan, Charles Larkin, Joshua Watson (sen. and jun.), E. S. Hills, D. H. Wilson, T. Gray, G. Moor, T. I. Proctor, J. Mawson, J. F. Grant, — Hindhaugh, T. Wilcke, &c. &c.

Mr. Garrison entered the meeting a short time before Mr. G. Thompson, who had not arrived from the Aylesbury meeting of the previous evening, in time for the commencement of the proceedings. The reception of the former gentleman must have convinced him that the aspersions against his character, unsupported by that evidence which his friends had in vain demanded from his accusers, had produced no injurious effect upon his anti-slavery influence.

The MAYOR (T. E. Headlam, Esq., M.D.), upon taking the chair, passed a brief but warm eulogy upon Mr. Garrison's character as an abolitionist, and an ardent friend of the cause of liberty, humanity, and justice.

The Rev. G. HARRIS then came forward and moved the following resolution:—

"That deploring the existence of slavery in any nation, as a wrong to human nature and a violation of the Christian law of brotherhood and love, and more especially deploring its continuance in a country whose declaration of independence bears attestation to the glorious principles, 'that all men are created equal,' and with 'certain inalienable rights,' among which are 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' this meeting welcome the brave, intrepid, and consistent champion of the rights of man, William Lloyd Garrison, and his able and indefatigable fellow labourer, George Thompson, and wish them God speed in their righteous, benevolent, and Christian efforts, to break every yoke and set the oppressed free." (Loud cheers.)

In the course of his address the rev. gentleman took a brief review of the career of Mr. Garrison, in the course of which he stated, that liberty had been violated in that gentleman's person by brawlers for democracy, but that unterrified and unseduced, he had kept his love for those who were in bonds. Who, therefore, would not rejoice to welcome such a man as that? (Cheers.) To the eloquent pleadings of his fellow-labourer, Mr. George Thompson—(loud cheers)—the inhabitants of that town had often listened with instruction and delight, and the meeting would not fail also to give that gentleman such a welcome as should testify their unalienated friendship and esteem.

R. W. SWANN, Esq., having seconded the resolution, it was carried amidst loud acclamations.

Mr. GARRISON, upon rising, was received with the most vehement cheering, and detailed some of the most prominent features of American slavery, and powerfully commented upon the injustice and indignity offered to British coloured subjects in the United States, who were arrested in American ports, thrown into prison, and were liable to be sold for the payment of their jail fees. The detail of this outrage upon the natural rights of man, and insult to the national honour of Great Britain, elicited frequent bursts of indignation. In reference to an article which recently appeared in the *Christian Witness*, Mr. Garrison said: I hold in my hand a periodical which I must beg leave to refer to, as it is one which I understand has a very large circulation throughout this country. It is called the *Christian Witness*, and is edited by the Rev. Dr. Campbell, of London. I will read the article:—"We wish (it says) our introduction on the subject of slavery, at the present time, to be rightly understood. Our act is wholly unconnected with the meeting recently held at Exeter Hall, to review the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance. Although repeatedly honoured by a request to share in the business of the said meeting, we preferred to stand alone, and take our own course. We act on grounds entirely independent, while our deed is prompted mainly by the course adopted by the Free Church of Scotland, and the Evangelical Alliance, respectively, with regard to American slavery. We know little about the new League that called the meeting, and we are not exactly at ease respecting Mr. Garrison." Well, the doctor is very much in the predicament of the slaveholders; they are not much at ease respecting Mr. Garrison, and I do not intend they shall be at ease until they emancipate their slaves. (Loud cheers and laughter.) "We are not exactly at ease respecting Mr. Garrison. His high qualities and his heroic course are not unknown to us, and to these we accord due respect and admiration; but still there were, there are, great difficulties in the way of our comfortable co-operation with him. We attended the meeting aforesaid, in the spirit of candour, to hear and judge for ourselves; and the result, as to Mr. Garrison, was far from favourable. The speeches of Mr. Thompson and Mr. Douglass were all that could have been desired; both were worthy of the occasion and of themselves. For America, we cannot speak, but we unhesitatingly affirm, that, in England, Mr. Garrison will command small sympathy and few friends, among either the wise or the good. He is not adapted successfully to address an English audience. He seems to have made the science of offence a special study, and he has, we think, attained to a high proficiency." (Cries of "Oh!") "Woe is me, my mother, that I was born a man of strife!" (Laughter.) I have tried to be as pacific as I could be in America. If I have been badly educated in this respect, it is owing to the existence of slavery in my otherwise dear native land. In regard, however, to this charge of proficiency in the so-called "science of offence," I believe it is a charge which has in every age been preferred against uncompromising and plain-spoken Reformers. (Hear.) The prophets erred greatly in that way; they had no taste,

and were actuated by a very belligerent spirit. There was that fanatic Isaiah, for instance, who began one of his addresses in this language, "Ah sinful nation; a people laden with iniquity; a seed of evil doers." "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint." "Wash you, make clean; who hath required this at your hands. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination with me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the callings of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your hands are full of blood. Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed." Very bad taste this. In extreme bad spirit, and excessively offensive withal. The same remark applies to the language of Jesus, to Paul, to the noble army of martyrs and confessors. In taking any great stand against iniquity we must use strong language, and we must, moreover, identify the criminal with the crime, or else we shall make no progress. Why, what did Martin Luther say in vindication of his course, "Almost all men condemn the tartness of my expressions; but I am of opinion that God will have the deceits of men thus powerfully exposed; for I plainly perceive, that those things which are softly dealt with in our corrupt age, give people but light concern and are presently forgotten. If I have exceeded the bounds of moderation, the monstrous turpitude of the times has transported me. Nor do I transcend the example of Christ, who, having to do with people of like morals and manners, called them sharply by their proper names—such as, "an evil and perverse generation, a brood of vipers, hypocrites, children of the devil, who could not escape the damnation of hell." If Sir, in America, we have to do with the greatest of all criminals—with those who are daily crucifying the Son of God—who are traders in human flesh—shall we attempt to draw out Leviathan with a hook, or his tongue with a cord which we shall let down? Can we bore his jaw through with a thorn? No; slavery is a power more fearful than any other found under the sun. The American church dare not grapple with it; the American clergy, as a body, dare not confront it. The whole of Christendom dare not attempt to give the Bible to 3,000,000 of heathen human beings in the United States of America. Dr. Campbell continues:—"He repeatedly went out of his way to assail the principles, or, if he choose, the prejudices, of his audience, in a manner from which to us he appears to breathe a spirit of fierce hostility to evangelical religion, and to cherish a feeling of bitter contempt for its institutions, its ministers, and its professors." Now, Sir, the Doctor took very good care not to refer to my speech, or to let the readers of the *Christian Witness* know what I did say. Why did he not do this? Because my speeches furnish no warrant for what is asserted in this article. I am sorry to be compelled thus to speak. I attack the evangelical religion because it is evangelical! Let any man, either upon this side of the Atlantic or on the other, rise and show, if he can, where I have ever attacked any party because of its peculiar religious sentiments, or have spared any sect or party found on the side of the slaveholder and against the slave. (Cheers.) Sir, I have been faithful, religiously impartial, in rebuking all sects and all parties in the United States; and any man who brings against me a charge of having singled out this, that, or the other denomination for assault, on the ground of its peculiar religious faith, or form, cannot support what he says by a single tittle of evidence. "And such," the Doctor adds, "we have the fullest reason to believe, are also the characteristics of his party in America." I will write to the Doctor, and see whether he will allow me to be heard in the columns of his periodical. (Loud cheers.) I will challenge him before the British public to make good those assertions against me and the Society which I represent. (Hear.) But the writer undertakes to furnish proof of the justice of what he says. Hear it:—"As an illustration of this, we offer the following resolution, lately adopted in New York, at one of their great gatherings, in the Broadway Tabernacle, on the 12th of May last, W. L. Garrison in the chair." Before I read the resolution itself I wish to observe that it is a mutilated one; that one-third of it is omitted. And in the next place, that, as it is, I am ready to go through the world and vindicate it in the presence of all men, and especially of all sincere and consistent Christians. I will first read the resolution, and then give the extraordinary comment of Dr. Campbell upon it. I request you particularly to mark its phraseology, and to weigh the true import of every word. "Resolved,—That this Society rejoice in the present declining state of American religion, inasmuch as it voluntarily comes forth to baptise and to sanctify slavery, which Mahometanism abolishes, and Catholicism condemns; and that it will endeavour to warn the world, particularly the so-called heathen portion of it, against its influence."

Mr. G. Thompson: The full stop with which it leaves off there, is a comma in the original. (Hear.)

Mr. Garrison: Yes, and omits the other part of the resolution. But, no matter, I will take it as it stands. In the first place, what is that American religion here spoken of? That is the whole question. It is that religion which sanctifies slavery in the name of God, and pronounces it to be a Bible institution. (Loud cries of "Hear.") That religion, we are happy to know, is declining in the United States, and the American Anti-slavery Society avowed that they rejoiced in the fact. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) Why, what is their declaration, but saying in so many words, that pure Christianity is rising—Christianity which is always upon the side of liberty. I say distinctly, that we do not rejoice that Christianity is declining, but that American religion, which is not Christianity, and which sanctifies slavery, that that is declining. Who will not rejoice at this? He who will not, possesses the spirit of an infidel, not the spirit of a just man or a true Christian. (Loud cheers.) "Slavery which Mahometanism abolishes." The allusion here is to the noble act of unconditional emancipation, passed by the Bey of Tunis, a short time ago; in which, for the glory of God and the good of souls, he declared all his slaves free. (Cheers.) Slavery which "Catholicism condemns;" referring to the bull of the late Pope of Rome, three or four years ago, against slavery and the slave-trade, in which he called upon the faithful throughout the world, to see to it, that their garments were not stained by any participation in the guilt of those systems. That was a good act of the late Pope, and I wish his successor would do a great many more of the same sort, and he shall have full credit for them. (Cheers.) "And that it will endeavour to warn the world, particularly the so-called heathen portion of it, against its influence." That is, the influence of a slaveholding religion. (Hear.) Sir, it is quite superfluous for us to do so, for the missionaries from America to the Karens, a heathen tribe in Africa, have written home in great distress and perplexity. What is the matter? Why, the Karens have found out that the Americans are a slaveholding and a slavetrading people. They say, "You want to convert us to your religion, in order to make us slaves, and we will not hear you." [A

voice: "Well done them."] (Laughter.) Yes; the heathen are rising even now in judgment against the religion of the United States of America. Now, observe the extraordinary comments of the Doctor upon this resolution:—"'Decline' is the precursor of dissolution. If, then, the 'decline' of religion (the Doctor does not use the phrase employed in the resolution, as he was bound to have done—"*American* religion" but he leaves out the word "American," which is the peculiar and distinctive feature of the whole resolution. "If, then, the 'decline' of religion) gives joy to 'this Society,' surely its extinction would excite rapture. The principle, then, of 'this Society' is, infidelity! Its meet motto, we infer, is, Let Christianity perish, that the slave may go free!" So, then, according to this writer, to rejoice in the decline of a man-embrutting, heaven-defying, slaveholding religion, such as that of America, is infidelity! Does the resolution either say or imply anything in disparagement of Christianity? No; the language is clear and explicit. We speak of "the decline of a particular religion, which we call American religion, state why we do so, namely, because it voluntarily comes forth to baptise and to sanctify slavery." That religion, we have daily evidence, is declining, but Christianity is daily rising. Christianity is asserting its power over the land, and we are therefore glad; and for this we are denounced in the *Christian Witness* as infidels! Sir, in this instance, it is not a true *Witness*. Sir, neither I, nor the men whom I represent, are infidels. I will not make a clamorous profession of Christianity. If my life, labours, walk, and conversation do not testify for me, I am an imposter, and what I may say can never do it. (Cheers.) What sin have I not rebuked? When have I ceased to love and venerate the name, the character, and the example of Christ? Upon what grounds have I based my opposition to slavery, if not upon the broad ground of Christianity. (Hear.) I have always maintained, that Jesus Christ was the great pioneer in this movement, and to him shall be the glory of its consummation, and not to us. (Loud cheers.) Why, how is it, that any man can be deceived in this matter? Look across the Atlantic, and see what the abolitionists have done. For nearly twenty years we have been vindicating the Bible as the best of all anti-slavery books. Is the Bible an infidel work, that we, who love it, are called infidels? Through all these years we have been vindicating the true church of Jesus Christ as an uncorrupted anti-slavery church. Does that look like infidelity? For twenty years we have been vindicating the ministry of our Lord as a mission of liberty to the captive: does that look infidelity? Why, Sir, the anti-slavery movement of America is the grand Christian movement of the age. (Cheers.) We are vindicating Christ, and supporting the pure and undefiled religion of the Bible. Our blessed movement is a missionary movement, a tract distributing movement, an education movement; in fact, we are promoting the advancement of everything that is good, true, and holy. Whatever concerns man for time and eternity is looked after by the Anti-Slavery movement, in the rescuing of so many millions of human beings from the condition of brutes, and their elevation to the dignity of man. Why, the writer of this article, in a subsequent clause, says the whole of the American churches in this matter of slavery are steeped in guilt, and slavery there is far from friendless. That is our charge, and our justification of the resolution,—"the American churches are steeped in the guilt of slavery," says the writer; and what is that, in effect, but saying, that they are not Christian churches. They are a body of pro-slavery churches. Not all of them, however; no, there are many among the churches in our land which have washed their garments white. There is the testimony of thousands who are true to the principles of Christianity and of freedom, and the glorious work is still spreading. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. George Thompson rose amidst loud cheers, and said: Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen,—I deem it due to truth to say, that we do not meet here under the auspices of the Newcastle Anti-Slavery Society. The reason I believe to be, that the minds of some of the members of that Society have been poisoned against my beloved brother, William Lloyd Garrison. (Loud cries of "Shame.") "Some enemy hath done this." There was a time when my dear friends in Newcastle were never weary of hearing me talk of the American Liberator. They seemed willing to sit "from eve till dawn, from dawn till dewy eve," while I told them of the early struggles of that man [pointing to Mr. Garrison], and his heroic and sublime devotedness to the cause of the oppressed, and often did they express their earnest desire to see him in the flesh, and show their attachment to his person and his principles. He is here; but, I am deeply grieved to say, without an invitation and without a welcome from those who once professed to be his admirers and friends. Sir, what I believed Mr. Garrison to be twelve years ago, I now know him to be, from having, during that period, watched his conduct, and fathomed his principles, and traced to its source every accusation brought against him. (Loud cheers.) How has his character been injured in this country? Thus: some years ago, his noble stand for the broad principles on which the American Anti-slavery Society had been established, excited the displeasure of certain clerical opponents in the United States. These men succeeded in effecting a rent in that Society, and unhappily there were those in this country who identified themselves with Mr. Garrison's enemies, and abandoned him and his devoted friends. A vile man in Boston, taking advantage of this state of things, sent over secretly a letter, containing a series of gross accusations, amounting together to a charge of infidelity and lax morals against Mr. Garrison and his coadjutors. They were accusations as false as the heart of their inventor was black; yet, and I blush for some I know while I say it, there were those in England who anonymously circulated those accusations, and they have ever since been doing their vile work, while their promulgators have been seeking to justify their conduct by the worst of all methods of traducing a man—by ambiguous phrases, by shakes of the head, and obscure hints—but never daring to point to any line Mr. Garrison has ever written, or to any act of his life, in justification of their slanders. Oh, I am glad my friend has come amongst you! (Loud cheers.) Where are his accusers to-night? (Loud cheers.) If there is one here, let him stand forth; or, if he will not, then let these two thousand persons bear witness that, when Mr. Garrison was here to confront his slanderers, they retreated from his presence and declined an encounter. (Immense cheers.) Our dear friend will soon leave us; but, during his brief sojourn, he has put the armies of the aliens to flight; and, should they ever

muster again, he leaves thousands who will fight his battle, and see that justice is done him. For myself, this right hand shall forget its cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, when I cease to be the vindicator of my friend, while he remains steadfast to the cause of the slave. Oh! who can be the true friend of the slave who is the traducer of the man before you? (Hear.) How can they wish well to the bleeding captive, and at the same time seek to assassinate the reputation of his champion? It is impossible. In every land, he who truly loves the cause of freedom and humanity must be the admirer and friend of William Lloyd Garrison. Thank God, no weapon formed against him has prospered. His spotless life, his martyr-like devotion, his eighteen years of unceasing and disinterested toil, his pure, ennobling, and Christian writings through that period,—these have established for him a character which the arts of his enemies can never undermine. (Cheers.) William Lloyd Garrison is the only man who can injure William Lloyd Garrison. (Cheers.) He has but to be to the end what he has been, in order to have the admiration of all good men while he lives, and to be held in veneration to the end of time. (Loud cheers.) I stand here to vindicate the resolution which my honoured friend, Dr. Campbell, has, greatly to my surprise, quoted as a proof of the infidelity of my friend here and his associates. A single glance at that resolution is enough to satisfy the mind of a candid person, that it is "American religion," and not the glorious and saving truths of Christianity, that is assailed. Joy is expressed that "American religion" is declining. The simple question, then, is, can we, as sincere Christians, rejoice in the decay of that religion? I am quite sure no one here would call me an infidel, if I said, I should rejoice in the decline of the religion of Hindustan, or China, or Japan, or Africa, or Rome. (Hear.) But the resolution is peculiarly guarded and explicit; for it states that the joy felt is over the decline of a religion which voluntarily comes forth to baptise and to sanctify slavery. Will my friend, Dr. Campbell, say, that Christianity baptizes and sanctifies slavery? I am certain he will not. The Christianity he preaches would throw wide open the door of the prison-house, and would raise the slave to the condition, the privileges, and the rights of a man. The late venerable Thomas Clarkson, when standing on the verge of the grave that has now closed over him, declared in writing, that the religion of America was opposed to the teachings of revelation, and led to downright atheism. Will Dr. Campbell call Clarkson an infidel? He will not, and he will soon withdraw what he has said of Garrison. He will read the resolution again; he will re-consider the subject; he will reflect upon the tremendous responsibility he assumes in the sight of God, when he brings a sweeping charge against those who are pleading a great and noble cause; and he will, or I am much mistaken, (and shall grieve to find I am so,) make much more haste to atone for the injury he has inflicted, than he did to commit it. (Hear.) I agree with my friend Garrison, that it would call for a shout of jubilee, if the religion of America, spoken of in the resolution, were to perish to-morrow. (Cheers.) Mr. Thompson having read the dying testimony of Thomas Clarkson upon the atheistical nature of American slave-holding religion, read various extracts from the theological writings of the most celebrated American divines, containing the blasphemous doctrine, that slavery was not merely tolerated but ordained by God, and sanctioned and supported by the religion of Jesus Christ. Among other instances, Mr. Thompson read a portion of a speech, which is not generally known in England, but the awful sentiments of which, having received the tacit sanction of the leading member of the Alliance, deserves the most extended publicity. At the triennial meeting of the General Assembly of the New-school Presbyterian Church, Dr. Cox, moderator, in the chair, the Rev. Mr. Campbell made one of numerous speeches, amounting to upwards of twenty, in defence of slavery, in which the following passages, among others of a similar nature, occur:—"The right of property in man was recognised in the days of Christ, for he said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.' He took notice of three different periods in the history of the human race—paradisaical, from the fall to the coming of Christ, and, subsequently, to this period. God has, during the middle period, recognised the right of property in man, and legislated about it. Whether it began with man or the devil he was not concerned to know; but, having been found existing, God's governmental actions recognised it. He then referred to the Abrahamic covenant. He did not affirm that God instituted slavery, but, having existed, God legislated about it, and gave to Abraham the right of property in man, and based his law relative to circumcision on the fact, introducing the master and slave into his covenant. Not so did he do with polygamy. He then appealed to the New Testament, and asked if there is any legislation on the subject there? The apostles did not legislate about it, not to approve or authorise it, but to regulate it until it could be put away. They talk about masters and servants, and give directions how the one should treat his slaves, and they demean themselves towards their masters. Here is legislation. No such legislation, however, is to be found on the subject of polygamy in the New Testament. Christ has especially condemned it. Hence if Christ and the apostles thus legislate about the right of property in man, how could it be a *malum in se?*" "This man," remarked Mr. Thompson, in commenting upon this passage, "pretended he did not know whether the 'institution' of slavery was from God or the devil. But God had adopted it at his recommendation, I suppose. What impiety! What utter blasphemy! Oh, if Mr. Garrison had said anything but half as anti-Christian, what chuckling there would have been! (Hear.) And would the slaveholders have offered 500 dollars for his head? Talk of killing him! Why, they would have killed him with kindness: he would have died the death of the fly in the pot of honey. Whether slavery originated with God or the devil, this supporter of slavery was not concerned to know. (Hear.) As they say in America, they are very little concerned about the paternity of the critter. (Laughter.) The Presbytery of Ripley, in the State of Ohio, in commenting upon the conduct of the New School General Assembly, of which Dr. Cox was moderator, had well expressed the feeling which governed the Evangelical Alliance, in reference to the slavery question:—"In reviewing the proceedings of the Assembly, this Presbytery is convinced, that, in order to secure unity in the church, as represented in the Assembly, truth has been stricken down. That the Assembly has attempted, at the same time, to serve God and mammon—to drink of the cup of the Lord and of devils. Resolved, 1. That on looking back, on our past action in not sending a Commissioner to the General Assembly, in view of its late

action, we are, as ever, fully convinced of the propriety of that action, and can hold no connexion with the Assembly which can subject us to its control, or imply fellowship with it, until it shall use all constitutional means to purge itself from slaveholding. 2. That we will consult with sister Presbyteries, on the propriety of forming an Anti-slavery Presbyterian Church!" Mr. Thompson then said: I will now proclaim the object which I have in view in attending this meeting. It is to take notice of the conduct of a Conference recently held in London, for the purpose of forming an Evangelical Alliance. I shall notice the proceedings of that body only so far as they relate to the question of slavery. I shall speak simply as an abolitionist, disclaiming, while I do so, any the slightest feeling of hostility to the professed object of the Conference. To preserve, as far as possible, the purity as well as the harmony of their body, they drew a line of circumvallation round themselves, by which they excluded entire denominations of persons calling themselves Christians, among whom were thousands, who according to their own admission, were conspicuous for their consistent illustration, in their conduct before men, of the example of him who "who went about doing good." Hundreds and thousands of men were excluded upon the bare suspicion of being unsound in their views respecting mere outward forms, and the manner of administering certain ordinances. There were many men in that Conference who had been members of a World's Anti-Slavery Convention, that had unanimously agreed that there ought to be no religious fellowship held with slaveholders, and that it was the duty of all churches to expel them. Again, the two countries in which Evangelical Protestantism most extensively prevails are the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the United States of America, and the religious intercourse between these nations is more cordial and upon a wider scale than between any other nations. But there exists in the United States an anomaly, a practical contradiction, without a parallel in the history of the world. As a nation, the people have declared that it is a self-evident truth that God hath created all men free and equal. Religiously, the people are engaged in various enterprises for the spiritual conversion and salvation of the human race. Yet, with this declaration, one-sixth portion of the population of the United States are subjected to the unutterable degradation of an absolute and perpetual bondage; and, contemporaneously with these world-wide exertions for the extension of the kingdom of Christ, there are three millions of human beings at their own doors, who are as much heathens as any race or tribe on the face of the earth. These three millions are not only in personal bondage, but from their prison-house, which reaches from the banks of the Potomac to the banks of the Rio Grande, their tyrants have excluded every ray of light that could guide their feet into the way of endless peace. Their tyrants have extinguished the lamp of life. They have resolved that the Bible shall not be given to their slaves, and thus the chart which has been given to enable the wandering soul to reach the haven of rest has been withheld. All this was well known to the members of the Alliance. They knew that the churches of the free states were in full and intimate communion with the slaveholding churches of the south—that the prevalent theology of the United States was pro-slavery, even the theology of Princeton, Andover, and Yale, as well as of Richmond and Charleston. They knew, too, that the United Associate Synod, the Reformed Presbyterians, and the Relief Synod, of Scotland, had taken the ground of non-communion with slaveholding churches. They knew that they had led the religious public of this country to believe that they had determined to exclude slaveholders by the resolution they there passed. All this they knew when the Committee met in London, yet that Committee gave cards of membership to Dr. Cox, who had sat as Moderator of an assembly of man-stealers; to Dr. Smythe, who had been rejected by the Irish Assembly; to Dr. Olin, who had openly declared, in the American methodist Conference, that he had held slaves and would hold them again; to Mr. Morse, the known vindicator, for years, of the system of slavery, and the equally well known calumniator of the abolitionists; in fact, to all who applied, no matter how deeply stained by their previous or present connexion with slavery. This was, indeed, a bad beginning. As was the beginning, so was the continuance, and the end of the proceedings, as we shall see by the review upon which I shall now enter. (Mr. Thompson then reviewed, at considerable length, the proceedings of the Conference.)

C. Larkins, Esq., then moved:—

"That, having listened with painful interest to the details of American slavery now made by Wm. Lloyd Garrison and George Thompson, this meeting express their deep abhorrence of the flagitious wrongs and outrages inflicted on their negro brethren; and pledge continuous effort for the exposure of the great crime of slaveholding as existing in the United States, until the 'accursed thing' shall root and branch be extirpated from the land."

Joseph Watson, Esq., seconded the motion; which was passed unanimously.

Mr. Garrison having returned thanks to the meeting in the name of the 3,000,000 of slaves in the United States, moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman; which, having been seconded by Mr. G. Thompson, was passed with acclamation.

The Chairman thanked the meeting for the honour they had conferred upon him. It was to him a great satisfaction that he had been able to give some sanction to the imposing proceedings of the evening, and to do some small service to the great cause in which Messrs. Garrison and Thompson were engaged.

A resolution was proposed and seconded, conveying the thanks of the meeting to those "working men," by whose persevering exertions the meeting had been convened, despite the apathy, and even opposition of certain professed abolitionists in Newcastle, whose duty it was to have been foremost in carrying out that object. As the Mayor had left the chair, the resolution was put by its mover, and carried with great applause. The meeting then separated at twelve o'clock.

PUBLIC BREAKFAST TO MESSRS. THOMPSON AND GARRISON AT WILCKIE'S HOTEL.

On Saturday morning, a numerous and respectable company assembled at Wilckie's hotel, at a public breakfast to the anti-slavery champions.

The Rev. G. Harris, in the absence of the Mayor, presided. The repast having concluded,

Mr. Garrison rose, and gave an interesting account of the position of the several Anti-slavery and Pro-slavery parties in America; and vindicated the American Anti-Slavery Society from the attacks which had been made upon it. He also referred to the calumnious reports which had been circulated respecting himself,

nearly all in the most underhanded and secret manner. He regretted, too, that his maintenance of the right of the female members of the Anti-Slavery Society to be allowed to speak had given umbrage to some of the Friends in this country, and that his most active opponents in this country were persons belonging to that body.

Mr. Edward Richardson (of the Society of Friends) assured Mr. Garrison that all the members of that body did not entertain such feelings of hostility towards him as the parties to whom he had referred. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. James Rewcastle wished that Mr. Garrison, in the recent Anti-slavery meetings, had referred more prominently to the slavery of drunkenness. (Expressions of dissent.)

Mr. Garrison replied, that upon the Anti-slavery platform he had no right to advocate any other than the Anti-slavery cause. One of the accusations which had been made against him by the London Anti-Slavery Committee was, that he had mixed up other matters with the abolition movement. Mr. Garrison then entered into an explanation, amidst several other points, of the reasons which had induced the American Anti-Slavery Society to advocate a repeal of the American Union as a means of effecting the emancipation of the slaves.

Mr. G. Thompson entered into a lengthened statement of the position of the Anti-slavery cause in England, and concluded by soliciting the support of the friends of the negro to the Anti-Slavery League.

A large number of persons then came forward and enrolled their names as members, and a meeting was advertised shortly to take place for the appointment of a Local Committee and officers, and to consider the best means to be adopted for the purpose of carrying out the objects of the League upon the most extended scale.

Thanks having been voted to the Chairman, the meeting adjourned.

PUBLIC MEETING AT LIVERPOOL.

(From a Correspondent.)

Upon the termination of the recent proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, the Council of the Anti-Slavery League assembled, and, after the most deliberate consideration, came to the unanimous conclusion, that the compromise which the Conference had effected with the representatives of the transatlantic churches, was entirely foreign to the Christian sentiment of England on the question of slavery, and diametrically opposed to the voice of the whole evangelical world. They, therefore, resolved, at all events, to test the opinion of the British public upon the matter, and feeling assured that the large majority of the members of that body had acted from honest, although mistaken motives, the League Council were satisfied that the result would be the immediate retracing of the steps of these misguided men, and the instant abandonment of that false position in which they had unhappily suffered themselves to be placed, when it was perceived, that that union with "the American delegates," which had at first been so dearly purchased by the sacrifice of a vital principle of religion and humanity, could only be maintained by the loss of communion with the whole Christian world,—a loss far outweighing any fancied benefits derivable from an imaginary ecumenical alliance. In order that this expression of public opinion might be full, free, and impartial, the Council further determined that it should be elicited, not in localities whose inhabitants were supposed to be indifferent to the subject, but under circumstances the most favourable for the defence—if such could be made—of the Alliance. With this view a meeting was held on Thursday last, at Aylesbury, a town in which one of the most zealous Secretaries of that body, the Rev. Alexander Digby Campbell, resides, where he has long and most successfully ministered as a clergyman of the Established Church, and where he has also commanded deserved respect and popularity. The Alliance had, moreover, held a great gathering in the town only a few days previously, at which some of their most talented, pious, and influential members assisted, presided over by the distinguished head of that body, Sir Culling Eardley Smith. And yet, notwithstanding this strong guarantee for a favourable auditory, for the official champion of the Alliance, at an open public meeting, without any restriction of tickets, where not merely brief questions were permitted to be put to the advertised speakers, to which vague answers might be given, but where the most ample discussion was courted,—in that very spot the unanimous verdict of the inhabitants of Aylesbury,—assembled in the identical scene of the Evangelical Alliance triumph, the County-hall—was that of unqualified condemnation, at the same time coupled with a vote of entire confidence in Mr. G. Thompson, and the principles and proceedings of the Anti-Slavery League, and also expressions of approval of the American Anti-Slavery Society. On Monday evening, October 19, a further trial of the public feeling of England upon this point was made in the important town of Liverpool,—a town important upon the present occasion, among other reasons, from its having been the cradle of the Evangelical Alliance,—important, also, from its being the residence and place of ministry of the Rev. William Bevan, co-secretary of the Evangelical Alliance with the Rev. A. D. Campbell; Mr. Bevan having, moreover, previously attained a high anti-slavery reputation, from his official connexion as secretary of the Liverpool branch of the Anti-Slavery Society;—important, further, from its being the scene of the valedictory meeting to the American Delegates;—important, in the next place, as being in the immediate locality of the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Byrth, the warm panegyrist of Dr. Cox and his American "brethren;"—important, likewise, from being the scene of the Christian labours of the Rev. Mr. Ewbank, who, it is said, undertakes to defend slavery as a Scriptural institution;—and important, finally, from being the great focus of the American trade with this country. American influence being so far predominant as not only to produce, in too many instances, a Christianity of the same description as that of Mr. Ewbank—genuine Louisiana Evangelism—but leading many of the non-professing portion of the community to imagine their interests identified with American prosperity, and to regard American prosperity as contingent upon the continuance of "the patriarchal institution" of slavery. As at Aylesbury, the platform of the Anti-Slavery League was open to all comers in defence either of the Alliance or the Free Church of Scotland; and yet, although upwards of 2,500 of the inhabitants of Liverpool were assembled last evening, pursuant to repeated advertisements and placards, in the confident expectation of hearing a defence of the pseudo-Alliance from its official agent, Mr. Bevan

neither Mr. Bevan, Dr. Byrth, nor Mr. Ewbank, nor any other friend of the Alliance, was present, to protect it from the charge of sanctioning and encouraging the system of American slavery. Liverpool has pronounced the same sentence of guilty against the Alliance as a pro-slavery body, which has successively been recorded at Norwich, Bristol, Wrexham, Manchester Aylesbury, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and elsewhere.

George Thompson, Esq., having been unanimously voted to the chair, said, he would have preferred, infinitely preferred, that some other person had occupied that situation; but the fact was, they had asked no individual in Liverpool to preside upon that occasion. They were there to utter the language of stern truth on certain unpopular topics that night, in reference to which they were ignorant of the feelings and opinions of the persons there assembled, and also of those out of doors in the town. They asked no man to commit himself to the smallest extent, to the views which they held on certain vexed questions, before he had heard the whole truth upon those questions. They (the audience) were there to listen to certain gentlemen, who, in the discharge of their solemn duty, would bring before them the true character of American slavery, and also the conduct of certain parties in this country upon that subject. All he asked of them was, that they should listen with unprejudiced and impartial minds, and that they would hold the parties upon that platform guiltless of any wish to injure the influence or reputation of any human being in the world, any further than he in his judgment believed that influence to be a bad influence. Once for all, he would deny, with all the emphasis possible, the truth of certain malicious accusations that had been brought against the parties then before that meeting. (Hear, hear.) It was not the first time that he had stood upon a platform in Liverpool to advocate the extinction of slavery. (Cheers.) He believed he had the honour many years ago—in the days of comparative youth—of being the first person that ever addressed a large and indiscriminate public audience in the town of Liverpool, with reference to the abolition of negro slavery. (Cheers.) From that time to the present his views had remained unchanged, and he had felt it his duty to ascertain, as far as he was able, who were and who were not the sincere and uncompromising friends of the slave. He was there that night to declare his honest conviction, that there was not on the face of the globe a more devoted, uncompromising, disinterested, self-sacrificing friend of the negro, than his distinguished brother then before them—William Lloyd Garrison. (Loud cheers.) The secret of the bitter enmity cherished against that gentleman was, that while other abolitionists had willingly committed themselves to the support of anti-slavery doctrines, while popularity was to be won by their advocacy, but were very unwilling to do so when nothing but odium and hatred were to be gained, his friend Garrison, unlike such abolitionists, had been an abolitionist in all weathers, though the weather with which he had had to contend for the last fifteen or sixteen years had been almost invariably rough weather—stormy weather—weather which had made many men lose courage, hide their heads, and look out for shelter; his friend's offence was this—that, in the prosecution of his holy enterprise, he had not failed to rebuke, with earnestness and impartiality, the professors of Christianity of almost all denominations in the United States, who had given the sanction of their names, and, what was worse, attempted to give the sanction of Christianity itself, to the unutterably horrid and criminal system of enslaving men. (Hear.) There had been certain American ministers of religion over in this country, belonging to the Presbyterians of the United States, the Episcopalian Methodists, the Baptists, and many other religious denominations, going through this country maligning his friend—bringing charges against him—trying to destroy his influence, because he had for the last fifteen years been rebuking their slothfulness and temporising in the matter of slavery. He had been occupied during that period in denouncing the conduct of the churches of the United States, which were the bulwarks of American slavery. That was the secret of the bitter opposition to his friend Garrison. (Hear, hear.) Why did Dr. Cox, of New York, stand up in this town and utter calumnies without foundation, and as false as they could be? Because that recreant abolitionist had been by his friend exposed, as he deserved to be, and exposed as he should be — (cheers)—while there was a British audience in this country that would grant him (Mr. Thompson) a hearing, or an impartial journal that would publish the truth. That man had dared to say that Mr. Garrison, and the parties then on that platform were men of no character; that they were leagued together to overthrow human government; to abrogate the Sabbath; to plead the cause of woman's rights, while they disregarded woman's honour. That they were the preachers of high treason against the Government of the United States; that they desired to take the sword out of the hands of the magistrates; that they were taking steps to encourage a civil war in America, more unnatural than the battle of Chevy Chase and the wars of the Roses in this country. Dr. Cox had dared to utter that language, coward as he was, within twenty-four hours of the time when he thought he should quit the shores of this country—before his libels could appear in print—still more before they could reach the eyes or ears of the absent parties whom he accused. He (Mr. Thompson) declared that every word that that miscalled minister of religion uttered on that occasion was a falsehood. He had come there to prove it. He had challenged Dr. Cox to meet him either on the platform or in the public Press, and he now challenged any friend of that individual in Liverpool—he challenged his esteemed friend, the Rev. W. Bevan, the Liverpool Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, to meet him on that platform and defend Dr. Cox, for having desecrated his character as a Christian, for having violated his office, and brought disgrace upon himself and Christianity, by uttering as gross a libel as was ever promulgated by man. That was a free meeting; let any defender of Dr. Cox appear that night; let any defender of the Evangelical Alliance appear; let any friend of the Free Church of Scotland appear, and he was prepared to vacate that chair, to give him that platform, and allow him, without limit, to defend that individual and those bodies; and he would pledge himself to succeed in proving that there was no ground for the charges he openly preferred. (Cheers.) He had made these remarks in opening that meeting, in order that all might be in full possession of a knowledge of the object

the anti-slavery delegates had in view; and it would be for the meeting to judge, at its conclusion of the character of Dr. Cox especially, who, professing to be the friend of the slave, brought unfounded charges against a man whose whole life had been devoted to the cause of the slave. He should presently call upon his friend, Frederick Douglass, to address them; but, before doing so, he would say a few words regarding him. He was a slave. He stood in his master's ledger as a piece of property; they would hear speak that night a chattel personal, who could do nothing, possess nothing, that did not belong to his master; they would hear a piece of property speak. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) He was still a slave, if the claim of his master could make him one, or if the law of the United States could make him one—he was a truant slave, a man that had taken the liberty of stealing himself. (Cheers.) After being for twenty-one years in the condition of a slave, he had escaped, and reached the New England States. He was discovered by the friends of abolition, and thrust out into the field of anti-slavery, and in that field he had been one of the most devoted and most successful labourers that had ever entered it. To him they owed, in great part, the revival of that feeling in this country. He had been in almost every city of Ireland and Scotland, he had addressed numerous audiences in England, and was now there to address the people of Liverpool. He knew they would give him such a reception as would strike terror to the heart of the man who dared to call him his property, and to assume a right to the possession of a fellow-creature. He had no doubt they would shout him a welcome to the free soil of England, and a welcome to the town of Liverpool. (Cheers.) He, too, had been assailed by Dr. Cox, in a manner so brutal, that the worst enemy Dr. Cox had in the world could not wish him to do anything more to blast his reputation for ever in this country. And how had Frederick Douglass given offence to this reverend gentleman, this liberty-loving, free speech-loving American Christian. A number of Americans came over to a Temperance Convention held in London in August last. One of their meetings was a large one held at Covent-garden Theatre. Mr. Douglass was invited to that meeting, he attended it; he was called upon to address that large audience, and during his remarks he stated—upon a platform crowded by hundreds of the most distinguished philanthropists of the age, and surrounded by an audience who gave him a most cordial greeting—that in no part of the United States, not even on the soil of the Pilgrim Fathers, was a coloured man permitted to stand upon a platform with a white man. Did he do wrong or right in stating that fact? (Cries of "right," and cheers.) You say he did right; but he added still more to his offence. He stated that while they—these ministers of religion—had made the strongest exertions for reclaiming the white population of the United States from the demoralising effects of intoxicating drinks, they had utterly neglected the condition of three millions of their black countrymen; they had done nothing in the way of inculcating habits of temperance among them, and those reverend gentlemen did not then attempt to deny that fact. He said, also, that the coloured population, instead of being encouraged to practise temperance—to practise the means of ennobling themselves—had, when upon one occasion they formed a procession for the purpose of commencing the good work for themselves, been set upon by a ruthless mob, and the temperance hall which they had erected was by the same mob destroyed by fire. That fact he stated; and conjured the ministers then upon the platform, not to forget, when they went home, that there was a coloured population both in the north and south of the United States, that demanded their sympathy and called for their impartial exertions. Mr. Thompson then read a letter sent, immediately after that meeting, by Dr. Cox, to the *New York Evangelist*, and which was published in that paper, and had since arrived in this country, which stated, that the moral effect produced by that temperance meeting was superb and glorious, until Frederick Douglass appeared upon the platform, and spoke in a manner to ruin the good influence of all the observations that had been previously made. Frederick Douglass (said Mr. Thompson) must have been a most extraordinary man to destroy in ten minutes the effect of all that had been previously uttered by some of the most talented men of this country, and the rev. delegates from the United States to boot. Mr. Thompson, after reading the whole of Dr. Cox's letter, and most severely commenting upon it, said, the Doctor was the same man now as he knew him to be when he first saw him in 1833. The first words he heard him utter were addressed to him (Mr. Thompson) in this manner:—"Well, Sir; and so you are going to teach my countrymen; and do you think you are able to tell my countrymen anything that will enable them to improve their institutions?" He (Mr. Thompson) might have said that he thought he was; but he was more modest and said merely, that he was going to help the New England Anti-Slavery Society. The Doctor said, "Well, I suppose you are going to preach the doctrine of amalgamation. "What is that?" "Oh, that we should marry all our daughters to negroes." His (Mr. Thompson's) reply was, that he considered that quite a matter of taste, with which he had nothing to do. (Laughter, and cheers.) He was going to preach the doctrine that slaveholding was a crime in the sight of God—that immediate emancipation was the duty of the master, and the right of the slave. "Oh, but," said Dr. Cox, "the people on the other side of the Atlantic preach the doctrine of amalgamation," and then he added—"I would sooner stand by the bedside of my daughter, and see her expire, then follow her to the grave, and see the earth close over her, than see her married to a coloured man." These words, said Mr. Thompson, were uttered in the drawing-room of the Rev. Henry Grey, in the city of Edinburgh, in the year 1833. That was the state of the Doctor's mind then; and if he had ever been in a better state of mind since that time, he had returned, like a certain obscene animal, to his wallowing in the mire. (Cheers.) In his letter, before named, Dr. Cox, speaking of the manner in which Frederick Douglas, at that meeting at Covent garden Theatre, launched his missiles against the United States, further said, "that the man had been flattered, and used, and petted by certain abolitionists, not unknown to him (Dr. Cox), until he had forgotten himself." Now he (Mr. Thompson) would declare, in the presence of his Maker, that such an insinuation was a wilful falsehood, and that such an allegation had no foundation whatever in truth. He had said this at Manchester, where Dr. Cox had many friends, but none of them had dared to come forward in his defence. Was there any one of his friends in Liverpool who would stand forward in defence of the man

whom he (Mr. Thompson) charged with uttering that which was false, and which he must have known to be false? (Cheers.) Frederick Douglass had never been paid by the abolitionists of this country; he had lived by the fruits of his own pen; and as to his ever being misled, or yielding to the promptings of others, there was no necessity for that. He was prompted by his own heart, and did best when, following the teachings of that heart, he represented the wrongs of his sisters, his brothers, and three millions of countrymen, whom he had left in bondage. (Hear, hear, hear.) Dr. Cox further said in that letter, "that he came to this country the sympathising friend of Frederick Douglass, but that he was so no longer." Weep, Frederick (said Mr. Thompson, turning in the most mock heroic manner to Mr. Douglass), the doctor sympathises with you no longer! It reminded him (Mr. Thompson) of a pleasant anecdote told of Mr. Hoby, the boot-maker, in London, who, having made a pair of boots for a fastidious young gentleman which did not exactly fit, was waited upon the following day by his new customer, and very pompously told of the fact. Mr. Hoby expressed his desire to have them returned, and he would make another pair. "No, sir," said the gentleman, "I am come to inform you I shall never give you another order." "John," said Mr. Hoby, "put up the shutters." "Why sir," said the shop-boy, "the sun is shining, why should I put them up?" "This young gentleman," said Mr. Hoby, "says he will give me no more orders." (Great laughter.) So it was with Frederick Douglass. He might now go home, for Dr. Cox could sympathise with him no longer. Mr. Thompson dwelt at great length upon the conduct of Dr. Cox, and the American delegates to the Alliance, in so strenuously opposing the anti-slavery principles of such men as Garrison, Douglass, and others, in this country, and concluded his address by observing that he had been brought acquainted with the character and standing of those men, and he would repeat that, with the exception of three or four of them, the rest were practically the enemies of the cause of emancipation in the United States. (The chairman resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.)

Mr. Dailey, a coloured gentleman, from Philadelphia, corroborated Mr. Douglass's statement.

The Chairman then alluded to the article in the *Christian Witness*, and defended Mr. Garrison.

The Rev. Joshua V. Himes, of Boston, United States, one of the delegates from America to the Evangelical Alliance, then came forward amidst great cheering, and said Mr. President: I cannot leave this place without bearing my humble testimony to what I conceive to be the truth, and the truth relating especially to the question before this meeting. I sympathise in the Chairman's introductory remarks this evening, with reference to the American delegates; because I am acquainted with the men and the facts to which reference has been made, and I wish to say here, that I have no means of defending those delegates from the grave charges which have been made against them. (Hear.) I know that those men stand high in the estimation of a large class of the English and American community. But truth is greater; and moral integrity, when it is permitted to shine forth, will stand, when the momentary popularity of those who have made appeal—a deceptive appeal—to the people who are in a state of ignorance upon the great question, shall have passed away. (Hear.) I feel a deep interest in the cause of Christianity, of the Christian minister, and all that pertains to the Bible truth and Bible influence. Now, Sir, I cannot sympathise with a Christianity which takes from any fellow beings the Bible; why should I? I cannot sympathise with the Christianity which takes from them the knowledge by which we read that Bible; which takes from them marriage; which takes from them, as you have heard this evening, all that pertains to a man, in his natural as well as moral and religious rights. If, therefore, my brethren here are infidels, I am an infidel. (Cheers.) I do not think that anybody who knows me can accuse me of a want of faith in God's Word, in any respect. I, therefore, wish to bear my testimony to the Christianity of the Anti-slavery League of England, and the American Anti-slavery Society, cherishing the same principles in America on this question. (Hear.) I have ever agreed with them, and I do so to-night, and with my friend, Garrison, with whom I have been acquainted for many years, living near to him, and knowing him well. When I heard and read the statements of Dr. Cox in the public papers, I was offended to the very centre of my heart. I was wounded for the Doctor, to think he should take such a course. I was wounded on account of the disgrace that would be brought upon Christianity. I was wounded on account of the influence which that conduct would exert in corrupting the minds of the English people, leading them from their duty in relation to American slavery. (Hear.) As my time will not permit me, Mr. President, to go into the question before me, I only wish to bear testimony to these points. In relation to the meeting of the Temperance Society in Covent Garden Theatre, I have to observe, that I was present upon that occasion. I was acquainted with Frederick Douglass's communication and sympathised with it, because I knew he spoke the truth respecting the disgraceful treatment of coloured men in America. There were gentlemen upon that platform who could shake hands with Frederick Douglass; they could appear to receive him very graciously in England, because the English people treated him with great respect, and of course they must do the same; but yet Frederick Douglass would not have received that treatment in America, either in the city of Boston or in the city of New York. (Hear.) He would not receive that attention which he received here. Well, now, Frederick Douglass knew that, and he just brought that matter out; and I am here to bear witness to the truth of his remarks. I know they were cutting and stinging. It was mortifying to public men from America to be exposed and that, too, by a coloured man, who, in their own country, would be called a "nigger," in common parlance, and put on one side. Now, I like to see men honest; and, if I cannot shake hands with coloured men,—with negroes or "niggers," as they are generally stigmatised in America,—I will not do it in England. (Cheers.) I think the God of righteousness and of justice requires of Christian men—who are fond of calling others infidels—honesty, integrity, and consistency. (Hear, hear.) I want to say a word upon another subject. In the temperance meeting which has been alluded to, an American gentleman,—and a minister, too,—who was once an abolitionist, but altered his opinions, introduced the subject of slavery, and the evident intention of the illustration went to show, as he pretended, that a man might hold slaves and be a Christian. Mr. Garrison followed this pro-slavery gentleman, and, proceeding in the same line of argu-

ment as the preceding speaker, he endeavoured to demonstrate upon the same principles of reasoning, that a man might be a seller of distilled spirits, and yet be a Christian. That, I believe, was the clear scope and design of his argument. My friend, Mr. Garrison, it is well known, is a zealous advocate of the cause of temperance, and published the first paper which was ever brought out upon that subject; and not only has he advocated these principles, but he has consistently practised them also. (Hear.) Mr. Garrison asked permission to say a few words. He had not proceeded far before he made reference to the illustration which had been given by the preceding speaker; and, to my astonishment, that English audience would not allow him to proceed. I was overwhelmed, for I did not expect such a thing; for the man who had gone before was permitted to use the illustration for the sanction of slavery, and yet my friend, following the same line of argument, was gagged and compelled to sit down. (Hisses, and cries of "Shame.") Mr. Garrison, having been thus unfairly interrupted, finally left the meeting. I was hurt at the time, and I have been hurt ever since, at the treatment my friend received. I think it is not creditable to the spirit of Christianity. Even if I had been an infidel, I do not think that Christians ought to have treated him so. (Hear.) A word more, (and I will conclude,) in reference to the slave question in the Evangelical Alliance. A great body of the American delegates are influential men in their respective denominations. Those men are many of them members of slaveholding Synods or General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church. (Hear, hear.) Well, what could we expect of men who will have to go to Philadelphia next spring, sit down with slaveholders, sing, pray, talk, and commune,—what, I say, could we expect of such men here? But Dr. Cox must be there, or else he will have to leave his connexion. Now, the doctor knew, that, if he took his position here, he would have to become citizenised in England; and it would not do for him, then, to have gone back to America. So with Dr. Smythe, Dr. Olin, and Dr. Baird; they all belong to slaveholding associations. Well, then, there are, besides, presidents of religious institutions. I had an opportunity of seeing the whole thing. In all the Committee meetings, where there was much anxiety, where one sat something like forty hours discussing a question which might have been easily settled,—in all these Committee meetings, there were some of these presidents of academical institutions. Who do these men educate? Slaveholders' sons. (Hear.) What could you expect of such men as those in favour of the slave? They must either lose the slaveholders' sons from their institutions, or they must take the course which they did. Now, there is no mystery with these gentlemen themselves about the matter. Some of these delegates also were ministers of slave-holding states; and, had they voted against slavery here, when they went back, they would have been Lynched. But, what made me feel most deeply of all in this transaction, was the deception which was manifested in the explanation of the difficulties into which they were cast. "Here we are in difficulty," said they. "Difficulty! what is the matter?" "Why, our brethren have stolen a great many men. They have established an institution to retain these men whom they have stolen; and they have thereby rendered it very difficult to get rid of them: therefore, in these peculiar circumstances, you must let us alone." That is the plain English of the matter. Bishop Meade's letter was read—the letter which has been referred to to-night. It was listened to by the Rev. Mr. Bickersteth, who, as almost every body knows in this country, is a gentleman of high integrity and piety; and it pained me to perceive how Mr. Bickersteth, with his kind and benevolent heart, was affected by that letter of Bishop Meade. I knew, all the time, that the sentiments it expressed were the sheerest deception and hypocrisy. I knew well the object. Bishop Meade stated that they were willing to deliver their slaves, and give them up, but that they could not, from the peculiar circumstances of the case. They brought out a number of cases where the friends of the slave were puzzled, perplexed, and troubled about the question, and wanted to get rid of it, but could not. Well, now, I knew better all the time—(cheers)—and every American who knows anything about the slavery in the United States, knows the utter falsity of these statements. Why, let them take a journey to Canada, and take their slaves with them; and, when they go home, let them leave them behind them, and they would be all safe. (Loud cheers.) Queen Victoria is ready to take the whole of them. (Renewed cheering.) If they will give them up to-morrow, I will insure, on the part of the English Government, that they will take care of every man, woman, and child of them—(great applause)—or, in other words, the English Government will put them in the way of taking care of themselves. There is another feature of the case respecting the American delegates which I wish to notice. The Alliance had a great and grand object in view, and many of both of our American and English friends were actuated, in the formation of that Alliance, by the desire of attaining this object. They expended a great deal of money, time, and labour, in the formation and establishment of that institution. Doubtless they were influenced by good motives in so doing, and desired to accomplish good in it. I certainly hold our English friends in the highest estimation for the labour and toil which they bestowed upon that Alliance. I believe when the question of slavery was first introduced into the Alliance, almost every member of that body was disposed to object in any way to the reception of slaveholders, or to give the influence of the institution in any way to the support of slavery. I am prepared to affirm and maintain that you could not have obtained a class of representatives from America who would have been more opposed to the support of anti-slavery views, or more efficient in shielding slavery than the men who were chosen. (Loud cries of "Hear.") Those who know the men in their various churches in America, know that I speak the truth in this matter. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Well, when we came into our meetings, one quailed, and another yielded, and then another; and, among them, some men who, I thought, never would have yielded. I took them out, and conversed with them upon the matter, and said to them, "How is this? Are we to be left alone—two or three of us—in the midst of a faithless majority? We supposed these Englishmen were all anti-slavery men." "Oh!" said they, "but we must do something. It will not do to break up the Alliance; it will tear us all to pieces. They first began to cower and quail; they then began to listen to the stories of these men. Then they began to say, "Now,

154

Patriot Oct. 22. 1846

we are under such and such circumstances, and we are placed so and so. If this resolution passes, it will break up the whole thing, and the Alliance is gone." They had one grand object in view; they had laboured hard, spent their money, time, and influence, all to bring about this one object, and they were not willing to give it up. There seemed to be the point. They had to choose either the rejection of their American brethren, as they came forward with their pro-slavery views and feelings, or else their own principles. There was no other alternative. "Either we must reject the delegates, or we must reject the slave and the anti-slavery interest; one or the other." Forty hours were spent in considering how they could receive them both; how they could have two masters. They were puzzled how to serve their American masters who were defending slavery, and, at the same time to serve the slave. The corrupting, demoralising influence of slavery was never more manifest —never achieved more in twenty-four hours—never made greater havoc with conscience and moral integrity, since the world was made. (Cheers.) After we could not obtain or sustain the first resolution, that slaveholders should be rejected, they brought forward another question respecting slaveholders of their own fault, and so forth,—which you have all heard. I voted against that, because it was a compromising of the whole principle, and was worse than no resolution at all. Finding they could not do anything really, I was glad that they did not do anything at all upon the question. I told them, however, this: "The people of England and the people of America will take up this question. This is not the end of it." (Loud cheers.) They are now trying to destroy my reputation. (Hear, hear, hear.) I have been associated with Mr. Garrison; what for? Why, to destroy my religious character, because they have chosen to assert that he is an infidel, without daring to prove the statement. So, of course, I go that way. Then I am associated in another way with a very unpopular man in America. I was told, that I had destroyed my religious and moral influence. I replied, when I was thus accused, wounded, and treated with contempt, "I am a man; I am a man; I have got the truth, and this truth will stand, and it will sustain me and itself too." (The rev. gentleman resumed his seat amidst loud cheering.)

Upon the motion of the Rev. Mr. Clare, the following resolution was put, and carried unanimously:—

"That the conduct of the Free Church of Scotland, in taking the money of slaveholders, and, in return, extending to them the sanction of full communion with that body, and that of the Evangelical Alliance Conference, recently assembled in London,—first, in adopting a proposition declaring that men might be slaveholders without any fault of their own, and from disinterested motives; and then, to gratify the pro-slavery spirit of the American delegates, erasing from their proceedings all reference to the subject of slavery in order to prevent a disunion, evinced in both cases an utter disregard of the corresponding spirit of Christianity, and was a virtual approval of the acts of those who, while they profess to be the followers of the great Redeemer, make merchandise of the bodies and souls of men."

A vote of thanks to the Chairman was then passed, and the meeting separated at eleven o'clock.

Letters to the Editor.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Sir,—Will you allow me to correct a trivial error in your report of the proceedings at the Wrexham Anti-Slavery meeting; not that the error is of the slightest consequence to any one but myself: but, as your reporter understood me to say, what was not the fact, it is due to myself to ask you to correct it. In stating that I had been a member of the Evangelical Alliance ever since I had loved the whole brotherhood, I was understood by your reporter to have meant, that I was a member of the recently attempted organisation bearing that title. This Alliance I have not joined, not because an organised manifestation of Christian union is not to be most ardently desired, but for three reasons. First, the basis of the proposed union is (if I may be allowed to coin such a word) too *creedy*; the pale of the confederacy is too exclusive; the platform too narrow; the combination one of sects of the brotherhood, rather than of the brotherhood itself;—a confederacy unlike that which might have been formed on the simple and broad foundation suggested by Dr. D'Aubigné, and which would not have excluded from its fellowship some of the sweetest and most loving hearts which are to be found in the family of Jesus,—"The Word of God only—The grace of Christ only—The work of the Spirit only." This would have been a union with a base like that of another great combination—"The Bible without note or comment,"—broad enough to erect a pyramid upon, whose top might have pierced the clouds of contention and strivings about words to no profit.

Secondly. The lamentable position of the Alliance with regard to the subject of slavery,—a position which none but American Christians can regard, I should hope, but with feelings of the deepest humiliation and sorrow; but which position transatlantic religionists hail with ineffable joy, as a recognition by the British churches,—the salt, as yet, of the earth, that the churches of America, although in a state of putrescent and offensive rottenness, are members of the mystical body of the holy, the harmless, the undefiled One—of him who came to preach deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound,—who came to bind up the broken-hearted, to comfort all that mourn, to preach the Gospel to the poor.

But, thirdly. I could not join the Evangelical Alliance, because it holds out what I believe to be a false and delusive expectation to the church and the world. It teaches, that, by means of a manifested union of Christians, the world will be made to throw off its allegiance to the Prince of Darkness; to bend the knee, and do homage to the Prince of Peace; and crown, as "Lord of all," that Prince, who once suffered to bear the sins of many, before he shall come a second time without (an offering for) sin unto salvation. This has been avowed, over and over again, by the advocates of the Alliance, as the great, if not the consummating object of the union. Believing, as I do, with the simple, untraditionised text of the Word of God in my hand, that such an expectation is unscriptural, delusive, visionary, and dangerous,—as unscriptural as any of the traditionary dogmas which we have received from the Church of Rome, I could not, were this the only

ground of objection to the constitution and objects of the Alliance, ask for a place in its confraternal lists.

May the time soon arrive, "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, and we also appear with him in glory." Till then, let us all unite in one strong and loving effort to gather in his elect, testifying against, and denouncing whatever is offensive to him. Let us love all men, whether rich or poor, whether black or white; let us love the brotherhood, whether of our own peculiar and restrictive communion, or on the other side of its narrow pale, that so we may not be ashamed before him at his coming. "For yet a little while, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry."

CHARLES SABINE.

Oswestry, Oct. 17th, 1846.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

(From the *Anti-Slavery Reporter.*)

The final decision of the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of slavery was altogether unexpected. It was brought about by the protests, remonstrances, and united action of the great majority of the American delegates. They feared the consequences to themselves, should the original Report on slavery and slaveholding, which stood part of the minutes of the Alliance, be allowed to continue there, and bind them to the exclusion of all slaveholders who were so "by their own fault," or "for purposes of gain." They well knew, whatever hypothetical cases they produced to the contrary, that the rule, faithfully applied, would have severed them from their brethren in the south, and that an interchange of pulpits and fraternal intercourse would have been impossible, if that Report had been maintained. They well knew that if the innocency of their slaveholding brethren depended upon the proof that they sustained the relation against their own wills, and from an imperious and all-controlling necessity; or that they continued the relation solely for the benefit of the slave, their guilt would stand blazoned before the world. "If," says the Rev. James Smylie, a Presbyterian minister of Mississippi, in his defence of American slavery, "If it be a sin, and advertising and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the Divine law—and if the buying, selling, or holding a slave for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and a scandal—then, verily, three-fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven states of the Union, are of the devil." Nor was this rev. gentleman wrong in his conclusion; for so far from the churches in the south admitting the sinfulness of slavery, they defend it as a Bible institution, "in accordance with the example, or consistent with the precepts, of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles;" and that to maintain it to be "necessarily sinful," and, therefore, "to be immediately abolished," is "directly and palpably contrary to the plainest principles of common sense and common humanity, and to the clearest authority of the Word of God." Now, the American delegates knew, if their English brethren did not, that this is the language of presbyteries, synods, conferences, and other associations throughout the entire south. Nor could they produce a single testimony of any organised ecclesiastical body to the contrary.

The fact is, the southern professors of religion, for many years past, have thrown off all disguise on this subject, and claimed the Bible for the defence of slavery. The pulpit and the press, the ecclesiastical meeting and the social circle; books, pamphlets, sermons, reviews, letters, newspaper articles, lectures at college institutions, and speeches at public meetings, have been formally and deliberately employed to prove slavery a Divine institution, "a merciful visitation," "the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes!" We know what we affirm, and can prove what we say.

Moreover, these delegates knew that some of their most eminent theological professors, the brightest ornaments of their schools, had sustained the southern churches in their defence of slavery, from the Bible. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton College, affirms, that "the argument, from the conduct of Christ and his immediate followers, seems to us decisive on the point, "that slavery is not universally and necessarily sinful;" and that an obvious deduction from this is, "that slaveholding, in itself considered, is not a crime." And a greater man than he, Dr. Moses Stuart of Andover College, gives it as his opinion that slavery is not *malum in se*, and that the relation of slaveholder may exist, "*salvâ fide et salvâ ecclesiâ*," without violating the Christian faith or the church. He even descends to coarseness in his assaults on those who maintain the opposite doctrines; for, he adds, "After all the spouting and vehemence on this subject, the good old Book remains the same;" that is, in its teachings respecting slavery.

Such being the case, we wonder not at the extreme anxiety of the American members of the Alliance, with a few honourable exceptions, to get the Report rescinded. We verily believe, that rather than be the bearers of that Report to the United States, they would have broken up the Alliance, or, at least, withdrawn from it.

The conduct of the American delegation was in keeping with their ordinary proceedings in the United States. They stand aloof from the Abolitionists. *They vituperate them all*, though they well know that their strictures apply to a section—and that, too, a small section—of the general body. During their stay in England, some of them used the arts of misrepresentation so skilfully as to impose upon the simple-minded and the ignorant. But the secrets of American slavery and its supporters can no longer be hid, and we will do our best to drag both to the light.

With respect to the Report itself, we observe, it was a poor affair, utterly unworthy of a grave and Christian body such as the Evangelical Alliance assumed to be. It was built upon a compromise. It condemned slavery, but made a loop-hole for slaveholders to creep through, if their consciences would permit. We rejoice, therefore, that it was rescinded, though we cannot but express our condemnation of the motives and the reasonings which led to it.

The Evangelical Alliance having broken ground on the subject of slavery, was bound to maintain it, whatever might have been the result. *In the course, however, which it has taken, it has shown great infirmity of purpose and an unworthy succumbing to the slave power, that was both unmanly and unchristian.* They were bound to bear a solemn protest against American slavery; to record that protest in the face of the whole Christian world; and to call upon every branch of the American church implicated in upholding it to repent, and "bring forth fruits meet for repentance," and then

they would be welcome to its embrace. A noble opportunity for pleading the cause of suffering humanity, and of vindicating the sacred Scriptures from the profanations of slaveholders, has been lost; nevertheless, the Alliance may congratulate itself upon its escape from the entanglements thrown around it by the adoption of the original report. It remains to be seen what course the British members will take, now that the question is thrown open again. Will they stand by their former testimonies? or will they, for the sake of peace with the American churches, consent to be silent? We would respectfully and earnestly press upon them the duty of proclaiming, in terms that cannot be misunderstood, that they will have no fellowship with slaveholders, under any circumstance or pretexts whatsoever.

We are told that the arrangements finally determined upon, will, in their working, shut out slaveholders from the Evangelical Alliance. We trust it may be so, though we must confess, that we require other guarantees than that of individual opinions, to assure us of this. It is quite clear the American and Continental sectional Alliances are left at liberty to admit slaveholders without any restriction whatsover, and that they will do so there can be but little doubt: thus we shall have the strange anomaly presented to us of the foreign divisions being at variance with the main body.

(From the *Christian Penny Record.*)

The unhappy position assumed by the Alliance on the subject of American slavery continues to excite the almost universal condemnation of the people.

Look at the opinions of the leaders of the Evangelical Alliance. What are the sentiments of Sir Culling Eardley Smith on this absorbing topic? What did he say at the meeting held at Aylesbury, where he had the folly to denounce the *Patriot* for giving a report of the proceedings of the Alliance—a report which we were glad to copy, and for which the great majority of the religious public would be willing to accord their thanks? What did the president of the Alliance say with reference to slavery, on that occasion? In order to convince the meeting that it was possible for a man to be a Christian and a slaveowner, he publicly avowed that he knew a gentleman connected with the Brazilian Mining Company, who admitted that he was a slaveholder, and who justified himself as a Christian, and a member of the Evangelical Alliance, on the ground that the Company were obliged to employ slave-labour, because it was the only labour to be found in the Brazils; and Sir Culling added, "I should be ashamed of myself if I refused to hold communion with this, one of

JOHN WESLEY ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following is a letter written to Wilberforce by the Rev. John Wesley, dated February 26, 1791, and was the last letter said to have been written by that eminent and good man.

"Dear Sir,—Unless the Divine Power has raised you up to be as *Athanasius contra mundum* (Athanasius against the world,) I see not how you can go through your glorious enterprise in opposing that execrable villany, which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature. Unless God has raised you up for this very thing, you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils. But, 'if God be for you, who can be against you.'? Go on, in the name of God, and in the power of his might, till even American Slavery, (the vilest that ever saw the sun,) shall vanish before it. Reading this morning a tract, written by a poor African, I was particularly struck by that sentiment—that a man who has a black skin, being wronged or outraged by a white man, can have no redress; it being a law in all our colonies, that the oath of a black against a white, goes for nothing. What villany is this?

"That he, who hath guided you from your youth up, may continue to strengthen you in this and all things, is the prayer of, dear Sir, your affectionate servant,

"JOHN WESLEY.

MEETINGS AT GLASGOW.—Several important meetings have lately been held at Glasgow, under the auspices of the Emancipation Society of that city, attended by Messrs. Garrison and Douglass, with the object of reviewing the proceedings of the Free Church, and Evangelical Alliance in relation to American slavery. The first was a meeting in the City-hall, which was numerously attended—A. Paton, Esq., in the chair; the second, a ladies' Anti-slavery meeting. On the following evening there was a second meeting in the City-hall, and a public breakfast on the next morning at the Eagle Temperance-hotel.

Edinburgh Chronicle Oct 24/46

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

A public meeting assembled in Brighton Street Church, on Wednesday evening, to hear those distinguished abolitionists, Messrs George Thompson, William Lloyd Garrison, and Frederick Douglasss, on the subject of American slavery, in relation to the Free Church of Scotland and the recent doings of the Evangelical Alliance. On the same occasion a testimonial was presented from the anti-slavery ladies of Edinburgh to Mr Garrison, as an acknowledgment of his long and tried services in the cause of American abolition. Long efore the hour of meeting, the large church was crowded to overflowing by a highly respectable audienee, the majority of whom were ladies, who seemed to be deeply interested in the whole proceedings. John Wigham, Esq., was called to the chair, and was supported by a number of distinguished citizens long known as friends of the slave,

The CHAIRMAN rose and said—Before introducing to you, as the first speaker this evening, my friend Mr Garrison, I wish to say, finding that he has many enemies who have not hesitated to traduce his character, that I have taken some pains to get to the bottom of the allegations that have been brought against him. With regard to the political sentiments of our friend, I do not feel qualified to speak decidedly, as I am not thoroughly acquainted with the laws of the United States; perhaps I should not entirely agree with him on all particular points, but the principal and most unfounded charge that has been brought against him is, that he is an infidel as it regards the Christian religion. I have satisfied myself that this is utterly false; and if any man should dare to say that he is an unbeliever in the Divinity of Christ and his attributes as set forth in the New Testament, I would call for the proof. The facts are principally these. Mr W. L. Garrison has been an earnest anti-slavery leader for the last fourteen or fifteen years. He has published a newspaper all that time and has severely lashed the pro-slavery men of all parties, among whom were found, in the foremost ranks, many of the clergy; they, in particular, it is said, threw out insinuations against him. We can easily understand what the treatment of a dog would be, although possessing every good quality, if some half dozen respectable-looking persons were found running after him, calling "Mad dog." I do not mean to say that Mr W. L. Garrison has always been so guarded in his expressions as I would have wished. I have seen articles in the *Liberator*, which I thought injudiciously expressed—too strong—too sweeping. I do not admire harsh expressions, even where they may be deserved. There is great allowance, however, for persons placed as he has been. I felt this strongly, the other night, when talking on the slavery question with a member of the society to which I belong, who resides at Philadelphia. This person was so indifferent to the rights of the slave, so tender of all claims but his—in short, so unjust—that I felt my indignation so to rise that, could I believe all the Society of Friends in that city thought as he did, I should be ready to exclaim, "Oh, company of hypocrites! you are trampling upon your high Christian profession." You know James Buffum: a more straight-forward man I do not know. I will read to you what he says of W. L. Garrison. This letter is dated October 1, 1846:—

"I hope you will have an opportunity to become well acquainted with William Lloyd Garrison. If you knew him as well as I do, you would think him one of the best men in the world. If a pure life and a loving heart towards all men be anything; if to stand up in the face of persecution, and to count not his life dear to himself, that he may rebuke a guilty nation and plead the cause of the oppressed; if to deal his bread to the hungry, and hide the outcast, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, be anything to excite our admiration, then we ought to love and respect him. As to his life, it is as good as the best. For fifteen years his enemies have tried *in vain* to find the slightest stain upon his moral character, and that is something."

I believe W. L Garrison to be not only a first-day, but an every-day, Christian, bringing forth good fruits, and thus striving to glorify his God and Saviour.

Mr FREDERICK DOUGLASS then rose and said, that when he came to this place he did not expect to say one word, but to leave the whole time to be occupied by his friends Garrison and Thompson. But he had been requested to relate a circumstance of deep interest to himself, and one which he thought would gratify every British and every Scottish heart. Yesterday morning, while taking breakfast with a friend of his in Liverpool, he happened to look out at the window, and who should he see but a beloved brother—a brother who had been a slave with him, and had wrought with him in the city of Baltimore, eight years ago, but whom he had not seen since that time. He could not tell how he felt at seeing this brother slave from America—from republican democratic America, on British soil disenthralled. (Cheers.) They would be delighted to know how he obtained his freedom. Eight years ago his master let him as a cook to a vessel sailing to Boston, which was driven by stress of weather to Nassau, in New Providence, over which waves the British flag, and where no slave clanks his fetters or rattles his chains. Here he met with a coloured man, who asked him if he was a slave. He answered that he was. This person told him if he had not signed the articles of the ship with his own consent, that he was not bound by the contract, and that being on British soil he was a free man. He resolved to take the apostle's advice, and having obtained freedom, he proposed to use it. The officers and crew of of the vessel suspecting this, came after him, and chased him through the town. The poor fellow made his way to the woods, where he came in contact with a large thicket of briers, into which he plunged to avoid detection. He was here overtaken and dragged out, and then presented a most moving spectacle, as his arms, face, and back were stuck full of briars. When he came out, he cried with a loud voice that he was a slave, and that these men wanted to carry him back to slavery. This appeal touched the warm hearts of the persons around him, and they did not allow him to go back to bondage. He was now a British seaman, and had a British protection in his pocket, by which he could go as a free-man to any place he chose. (Cheers.)

Mr GARRISON.—Except to America.

Mr DOUGLASS.—Well, he does not intend to go there. (Laughter.) Almost the last words he said to him were, whatever else might go back to America he would never go back, at least to the slave-holding states. He (Mr Douglass) was happy to say that the British heart was right on the subject of slavery; and it was a glorious fact, that the moment a slave set his foot on British soil he was free. This country might be disgraced by apologies offered for slaveholding, and by scriptural arguments woven in defence of the American slave-system; but, thanks to God, by British law, no slaveholder could here lay his vile clutches on an American bondsman. He hoped that this would always be the case, and that wherever British influence and British institutions existed, freedom to the black men as well as to the white would also exist. (Loud cheers.)

Mr LLOYD GARRISON came forward, amid great applause, and addressed the meeting. He was amazed that he should be charged with being an infidel by men who held their brother as their property; for surely, if the slaveholder was not an infidel of the worst kind before God and man, there was no such thing as infidelity at all. (Applause.) They had been charged with departing from their proper mission, and entering upon a war with the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance. But why did they do so? Not because they had forgotten the slave? no; but because the Free Church had placed itself on the side of the slaveholder, and against the slave and because the Evangelical Alliance had bowed the knee to the Moloch of slavery, and refused to say one wor

against his bloody and impious reign? (Cheers.) Mr Garrison next alluded to his late visit to Belfast, and complained that some of the papers there were filled with malignant abuse of him, and with the foulest misrepresentations of his religious principles, solely for the purpose of deterring persons from attending the meetings of the anti-slavery deputation. But the real question was as to his fidelity to the anti-slavery movement. Had any one dared to arraign him that he was not a staunch and true abolitionist? No; not one of his traducers had attempted such a charge. The emancipation of the slave was his text, and abiding by it he would ask had the Free Church yet come to the conclusinn of sending back the money? (Cheers.) If it had not, then it was to be charged with being one of the great bulwarks which supported and protected slavery in the United 8tates, entertaining with religious friendship men who treat those made in the image of God as marketable commodities. He did not wish to pick a quarrel with the Free Church, or with any religious denomination whatever; all he asked was, that they should wash their hands of such heinous crimes, and have nothing to do with thieves and idolaters. After some farther remarks, Mr Garrison concluded by remarking that the delegates from America at the Evangelical Alliance were nearly all pro-slavery men, some of them being themselves slaveholders, all of them giving the right hand of fellowship to men-stealers, and eager in joining with the mobocracy in denouncing the abolitionists, to make them odious to the whole world. (Great applause.)

From the commencement of the meeting, the substantial and elegant present had stood on the front table of the platform for the inspection of the curious, and before the admiring gaze of the audience. The silver service, we observed, was of a very massive description and chaste design. Mr Thompson, who was sitting below, having handed up the tray and its contents, the CHAIRMAN, holding the coffee and tea-pot in his hands for a few minutes, Mr Garrison standing close by his side, thus addressed that gentlemon:—My friend, William Lloyd Garrison, I have much pleasure in having been requested by the Anti-Slavery ladies of Edinburgh, to ask thy acceptance of this tea service, coffee pot, and tray, as a token of their esteem and the high estimation in which they hold thy labours in the cause of the enslaved, more especially of those of the United States of America. Thy energy and perseverance under cruel persecution for a long course of years has excited both sympathy and admiration, and they trust that these articles may serve as a memento now, and, in years to come, gratifying both to thyself and the beloved companion of thy life. Along with this service, I have also great pleasure in announcing that a purse containing ten sovereigns has been added by a young lady, the daughter of one of the oldest Anti-Slavery advocates in Edinburgh. On the coffee-pot was engraved the following inscription:—

"PRESENTED TO WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON,
"OF BOSTON, U.S.,

"By the Friends of Freedom in Edinburgh, as an expression of their gratitude for his unwearied and successful exertions in the cause of the slave; and for his labours in exposing the cruelty and wickedness of slavery.

"Edinburgh, October 21st, 1846."

On the tea-pot were inscribed:—

"JOB, 29TH CHAPTER, 11TH, 12TH, AND 13TH VERSES:—'When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me;—Because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him.—The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy.'"

Mr GARRISON, having accepted the various gifts thus addressed the Chairman:—Sir, any man who assumes to be a reformer should be careful how he receives gifts, lest it might seem to be his object to be rewarded for his labours. I would feel myself called upon entirely to refuse accepting of this generous gift were it, not for the painful circumstances in which I am now placed on both sides of the Atlantic. If the enemies of freedom were not endeavouring to hinder my way by covering me with popular odium for the purpose of preventing the slave regaining his freedom, I could not prevail upon myself to accept it. But, Sir, I will receive this—it is a bright testimonial in behalf of many others associated with me. Am I and my coadjutors in the great work of abolitionism to be unjustly maligned? (A voice, No.) This testimonial is to be your reply against all those charges which have been cast upon my character. (Applause.) I will take these, because I want the American slaveholder to see them. I will take them, because I want the apologists of slaveholders to see them; and, likewise, because I want the coloured population of the United States to see them. (Great applause.) Sir, I deserve no credit for what I have done. If my feeble efforts have affected the question of slavery in the United States, it has been solely by the grace of God that I have been enabled to do it. For the man who professes to have the love of God in him, and yet sees millions of his fellow-men in slavery and bereft of human privileges, and yet does not raise his voice against the oppressor and endeavour to set the captive free, how dwelleth the love of God in that man? The New Testament is the grand charter of human rights and liberty, and I strive to give this volume into the hands of every slave in the country, and when he reads and studies it he will soon appreciate freedom. But often have I looked on and seen the oppressed stripped of all human rights, and this too. by the sanction of law. What would I have been doing had I not cried out against the law. I have done so, and while I did so, I have done nothing but my duty. Oh that I may see that I have discharged my duty as I ought to have done it, and that I have not overlooked it through carelessness. This gift is peculiarly agreeable, because it comes from the Anti-Slavery Women of Edinburgh. If slavery is to be extirpated from the world it is because the women will pioneer the way. It has been so in the United States, and it was so in the West Indies. I take my friend George Thompson as my witness in this matter. It was not Wilberforce, or Clarkson, or any of the distinguished male championsthat published the document that eventually overthrew slavery in the West Indies. It was a woman—and she, I believe, was connected with the Society of Friends—it was Eliza Heresh. When her pamphlet appeared, advocating immediate emancipation, the work was done and the slave was liberated within a few years afterwards. We ought to remember her on this occasion. I rejoice, Mr Chairman, in seeing you in that position to-night. You are a member of a society who will not tolerate a slaveholder as a member in any part of the world—a society which has existed for more than sixty years, and which has by its pure discipline debarred an entrance to the slaveholder. Such a distinctive procedure then is nothing more nor less than the effect of the love of God on

the soul. Oh! if the Free Church, the Established Church, and many other dissenting Churches would take the same position, then how rapidly the work of emancipation would progress. By this token of your kindness and confidence in me, I feel that I have fresh obligations laid upon me when I return to the United States. Then will this witness to me if I be unfaithful. Oh that I may be faithful; give me your prayers more especially, that I may have increased faith in God. And if at any time this principle should ever be corrupted by me—if at any time I may forget the slave—then I declare that these gifts will be forfeited; and if any other friend of the slave can be more faithful, then he has a perfect right to come into my house and adopt them as his. I am delighted at the possession of this gift, and I am only sorry that I have not found more suitable words to express the feelings of my heart than those which I have so feebly and imperfectly enunciated on the present occasion. Mr Garrsion resumed his seat amidst the loud and prolonged plaudits of the meeting.

Mr G. THOMPSON upon rising was received with prolonged and enthusiastic cheering, which having subsided, he proceeded to address the meeting as follows:—Mr Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I need scarcely say how deeply I participate in the proceedings of this evening. This is an occasion which I have long desired to see in Edinburgh—a night to behold which I have yearned many years—to witness my beloved brother standing in the presence of the assembled thousands of this city to vindicate himself from the foul charges which have been brought against him. (Cheers.) To the best of my ability, I have endeavoured, as his friend and fellow-labourer, to vindicate him. I have vindicated him in the name of truth, which is the attribute of God himself. I have vindicated him for his own sake, because I loved him, and because I believed him to be maligned. I have vindicated him for the sake of the cause which he pleads, to which from early life he has consecrated himself, for the sake of which cause he has lived a life of poverty, privation, labour, persecution, and danger. Oh, I have thought it a hard and strange thing that those who professed to love the slave, when they cast their eyes over the field of battle, and saw the struggle going on for the liberation of three millions of God's family from bonds, should be more anxious to discharge their weapons at the champion of the oppressed, than at their enemies. (Hear.) I deem it strange to-night that there should be those in Scotland, who for one word they speak or write in behalf of the perishing and enslaved millions, speak a thousand words and write a thousand paragraphs to defame and destroy the champion of the rights of those millions. (Cheers.) If they really loved the slave, they must love the man who is before you. They may deplore his errors in opinion, if there really be any to deplore; but the man they would be constrained to love. That they malign him, is proof before heaven and earth that they care nothing for the cause to which he has given himself. (Hear.) Their first evidence—come when it may—of their being sincerely the friends of bleeding humanity, will be to come forth and declare their penitence on account of having traduced and sought to destroy the noble advocate of the slave. (Cheers.) The other day there was a meeting of the Free Presbytery of Glasgow. A member of that Presbytery brought on the question of slavery. There were those present who objected to the introduction of that question; and there was one gentleman, a member of that body, a minister of a church in Glasgow, who said nothing about the question of slavery, but had a great deal to say in the way of defaming abolitionists. Now, in this city and other parts of Scotland, I have often challenged those who have traduced my friend to quote from any part of his writings evidence in support of their charges. For the first time almost in the history of the controversy, I find the Rev. Mr Lorimer getting up and producing something which he wishes to be received as proof in support of the charges brought against my friend and his coadjutor. I quote from the *Scottish Guardian*, which I believe will be admitted to be a fair source from which to take anything emanating on the other side of this question. The report in that paper of the Rev. Mr Lorimer's speech contains these words:—"But *there is still* another party in the crusade against us, which must not be passed over. I allude to the infidel and irreligious party. I hold in my hand a proof, a flagrant proof, of their infidelity. I do not refer to speeches delivered in this country or in England." Why not refer to these speeches? When I was in Edinburgh last, at the very last meeting we held, an autograph letter was put into my hand, signed by a certain gentleman named Cameron, the author of a pamphlet entitled, "The Free Church and her Accusers—a Letter to George Thompson,"—an autograph letter, I say, was received from that gentleman while I was upon the platform, which ran to this effect:—"Sir,—I have put what I have to say against you and in favour of the Free Church in print. I have since openly avowed myself the author of the pamphlet, and I call upon you to authenticate the statements attributed to you in the newspapers. Newspaper reports are partial; they are necessarily brief; they may be imperfect and inaccurate. Put your own name to any speeches you have delivered in this city, and I pledge myself to answer them, whatever they may contain." At the time he wrote this letter, he must have been somewhat of a bold man to undertake to reply to an individual, not knowing what he had said, or what he was going to say. If I am not mistaken, he undertook to disprove the truth of that which I had uttered or might utter. Now, it happened that at that time I was busy preparing a number of the speeches which I had delivered in this city, and amongst the rest were two lectures embracing, as I thought, a reply to every part of that gentleman's pamphlet, especially to the charges which he had brought against myself and the abolitionists generally. The pamphlet containing these speeches was published immediately after I left, for I saw nearly the last proof, and I am not aware that from that hour to this that doughty champion of the Free Church of Scotland has fulfilled the promises which he made—that if I would put my name to any speeches I had delivered, he would undertake to reply to them whatever they might contain. (Hear.) Now, Mr Lorimer might have gone to these speeches; or he might have gone to many other speeches which had been delivered in this country; or to published pamphlets, fully and honestly explaining our views upon the anti-slavery question. But he says, "I do not refer to speeches delivered in this country, or in England, I refer to a solemn resolution passed by the same party in the United States; not therefore a hasty utterance of an excited speaker, but a solemn resolution, adopted by a body of abolitionists. Nor is it of ancient date, but so recently as the 12th of May last. The meeting was held in Broadway Tabernacle, New York. The resolution ran in these terms. Before I read the resolution I will just state, that it was a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, held in a large church in Broadway,

New York, my friend William Lloyd Garrison being at the time in the chair. The following are the terms of the resolution:—"Resolved—That this meeting rejoices in the present declining state of American religion, inasmuch as it voluntarily comes forth to baptize and sanctify slavery, which Mahomedanism abolishes, and which Catholicism condemns; and that it will endeavour to warn the world, particularly the so-called heathen portion of it, against its influence." That is the resolution which was quoted by the Rev. Mr Lorimer. I must however take the opportunity of remarking, that the resolution here quoted is not complete; it leaves off with a comma, and the other half of the resolution which explains the former part is left out. This is no uncommon trick of our opponents, as I have shown upon many occasions. It is the way in which they quoted Dr Channing's opinion against the abolitionists. I had occasion in the course of the speeches I published, and to which Mr Cameron has not replied, to prove that he had, in a most dishonest, manner garbled and mutilated passages. That he had taken some passages thirty-two pages apart, and, having put them together, had made them read as continuous paragraphs in the same page of the work. Mr Lorimer then goes on to say, "So that we are to send forth missionaries to the heathen world to warn awakening converts against evangelical ministers and missions, as worse than Mahomedans and Papists. How can we explain this? What is the spirit of this resolution? It is open, naked infidelity." Now, I will put it to this audience to-night whither this is infidelity or not? That resolution calls upon a public meeting in New York to rejoice in the present declining state of American religion. What was I invited to do in this city only ten years ago? To deliver a lecture in the West Church, and other churches in Edinburgh, upon the inconsistency of the American churches in regard to slavery. What did I do upon those occasions? I proved that every leading denomination in the United States was connected with slavery-holding, buying, and selling human beings. I have read Mr Lorimer's own words in print at that time, and for years afterwards, that there was no religion among the Southern States of America. (Cheers.) The *Scottish Guardian*, the *Church of Scotland Magazine*, the Rev. William Cunningham, the Rev. Dr Candlish, Mr Lorimer, Mr Gibson, and Mr Begg, scarcely ever stood upon a platform, either in this country or in England, without denouncing the Southern churches of America, either as utterly without religion, or else having a religion which was a curse to man, and in defiance of the revealed gospel of God. (Prolonged cheering.) Now, mark the phraseology of this resolution. It rejoices in the declining state of *American* religion. May I rejoice in the declining state of the religion of India? Undoubtedly I may. Might I stand up in the presence of Mr Lorimer and be bold enough to say that I rejoiced in the decline of the religion of Rome? I might; and Mr Lorimer would no doubt get up and thank me for doing so. Might I say that I rejoiced in the decline of the Erastian Church of Scotland? (Hear, and laughter.) I believe I might; for I have read a pamphlet in this city containing a speech delivered by a leading Free Church minister—the Rev. Dr Candlish—in which he said, "Enter no church at all unless you can enter a Free Church." (Hisses and cries of "Shame.") What did this anti-slavery society propose to do? What did they mean when they said, "Resolved, that we rejoice in the decline of American religion?" Did they mean Christianity? No. Did they mean pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father, which consists in visiting the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and keeping ourselves unspotted from the world? No. Why, sir, the very resolution specifically and guardedly declares what kind of religion it is in the decline of which that society rejoices. What does it say? "Resolved that this society rejoices in the present declining state of American religion, inasmuch as it voluntarily comes forth to baptise and sanctify slavery." Well, is not Mr Lorimer prepared to do that? Does he mean to say to the Free Presbytery of Glasgow that he does not rejoice in the decline of a religion which voluntarily comes forth to sanctify and to baptise slavery. (Cheers.) He says, "A society which does rejoice in the doctrine of religion which sanctifies and baptises slavery is an infidel society." Then he would rejoice in the spread of a religion which does sanctify and baptise slavery. How? Is it infidel to denounce a religion which voluntarily comes forth to baptise and to sanctify slavery. Then he means to say that it is not infidelity, but faith in Christianity, to rejoice in the spread and perpetuity of a religion that does sanctify and baptize slavery. If he does not, what does he mean? Is it "resolved that the society rejoices, or will rejoice, in the decline and fall of Christianity? No. It is a spurious religion, a religion from beneath and not from above, that this society rejoices in the decline of. If it rejoices in the decline of this religion, what is necessarily implied? Why, that it rejoices in the rise, strength, extension, and progressive triumph of a religion that does not baptise and does not sanctify slavery. (Hear.) The resolution rejoices in the signs of the times, which encourage the abolitionists of that country who believe that the churches of that country, the northern churches, will separate themselves from the churches of the south, and that they will have a purer Christianity preached to the people—a Christianity that will not sanctify and baptise slavery. It goes on to say, "Which Mahomedanism abolishes and which Catholicism condemns." Alluding in the first place to the recent decree of the Bey of Tunis, a Mahomedan despot, who has utterly abolished both slavery and the slave-trade within his dominions. (Cheers.) Yes, at the very moment that the Free Church of Scotland were giving their hands to the slaveholders of America, the Bey of Tunis, a Mahomedan, was publishing and proclaiming throughout the whole of his dominions that, henceforth, there should be neither slavery nor the slave-trade within his dominions. (Cheers.) "Which Catholicism condemns"—referring to the bull of the late Pope of Rome—and I remember well when it went forth—calling upon the faithful everywhere throughout the whole of Christendom to wash their hands in innocency, and lift up a testimony against the enslavement of the human race.

"And that they will endeavour to warn the world, particularly the so-called heathen portion of it, against its influence." That is the last part of the resolution. So I say. Yes, Sir, I would, if I had the power, tell every heathen, every idolater, and every human being who is the victim of superstition, throughout the world, and to whom we desire to send the glorious gospel of the blessed God—that slavery and the slave-trade are no part of Christianity. I would tell them that if they heard of slavery in America, by men calling themselves Christians—buying and selling men, women, and children—not to ascribe that to Christianity. I would tell them that these men practically deny Christianity. I would tell them that these men libel Christianity. I would tell them that these men are con-

demned by Christianity. I would tell them that these were the men who crucified the Saviour afresh and put him to an open shame. I would tell them that Christianity was a religion of love and liberty; that all its doctrines and precepts were essentially of a free and freedom-giving character. Now, Sir, I contend that there could not be a more appropriate resolution passed in any assembly in the world—certainly not one more opportune, considering the circumstances under which the society were assembled in the month of May 1846. I ask this audience whether they are not prepared to rejoice, assuming the fact to be true that the religion of America sanctifies and baptizes slavery, when they hear that that religion is declining. (Loud cheers.) I, for one, am prepared to rejoice at the circumstance. (Renewed cheers.) I have been busy for the last twelve or fourteen years in denouncing that religion. It was the business of these very men themselves before they took the money of the slaveholders in the Southern States of America. (Hear.) They have on previous occasions commended me for denouncing that religion. They were never tired of heaping panegyrics upon my head when standing upon platforms to denounce that religion. These men thought I had not denounced it strongly enough. I thought I had denounced it strongly, and even violently; but I found, upon taking up the *Scottish Guardian*, that the editor of that paper had gone beyond me and made up for all my deficiencies by heavier and more severe denunciations of the American slaveholding churches. (Cheers.) "Resolved that this society rejoices in the present declining state of American religion, which voluntarily comes forth to baptize and sanctify slavery, and we will warn the brethren against its influence, against the influence of that religion which sanctifies and baptizes slavery." Now, if there is one gentleman present competent to occupy this pulpit and address this meeting in opposition to that resolution, I invite him to take my place and do so. (Cheers.) If there is one gentleman here prepared to defend the contrary of that resolution, I should like, above all things, to hear him do so. Mr Lorimer has not proved that this resolution is any thing but what it should be; he merely asserts it is not. I assert the contrary. I ask this audience to determine whether this is infidelity, or whether it is not a noble vindication of the religion of Christ from the disgrace which slaveholding has brought upon it?

Mr GARRISON here begged to say a few words in explanation of the circumstances attending the passing of the resolution referred to by the American Anti-Slavery Society. There had been great talk about revivals of religion in America; and it was alleged that there were quite as many revivals in the Southern States as in the Northern. The result hitherto had been, that the more revivals the worse the friends of abolition were off, and the more slavery appeared to grow in America. But, just as the anti-slavery feeling advanced in the country, the religion of Christ progressed—that religion which was essentially a freedom-giving religion. Those spurious pro-slavery revivals were going down, and it was not in the power of the ministers and the leading religionists who were upon the side of slavery to get up these excitements, as they were once in the habit of doing, to cover their own iniquity. The American Anti-Slavery Society rejoiced in the decline of those revivals and that kind of religion; because the American Anti-Slavery Society was a Christian society, and delighted in the knowledge of the growth of the religion of Jesus Christ. In their view, that religion was spreading in America, and just as far as it advanced, the other religion was going down. Mr Garrison then went through the several clauses of the resolution, and explained and briefly defended them.

Mr THOMPSON then proceeded. I think enough has been said with regard to Mr Lorimer's resolution, and the infidelity of my friend who has addressed you, as well as the American Anti-Slavery Society. If that be infidelity, I hope that such infidelity will very soon be prevalent over the face of the whole earth, when there shall no longer be presented the spectacle of a tyrant on the one hand, and a victim of tyranny upon the other. I am anxious to-night to say a few words on the course which the Evangelical Alliance has pursued. I have recently taken the verdict of 20,000 of my countrymen upon that subject. These embrace an audience of between 5000 and 6000 assembled in Exeter Hall; one of 3000 in the city of Norwich; one of 1500 in the city of Bristol; one of 1000 in the town of Wrexham; an audience of 500 or 600 in the town of Aylesbury in Buckinghamshire; one of 4000 in the town of Manchester; one of 2000 in Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and one of 2500 in Liverpool, on Monday evening last. All these have been free meetings, without charge for entrance, and at which invitations have been given to any defenders of the Alliance to come, and, without limit, address the audience on behalf of the proceedings of the body with which he was connected. In two or three instances a defender of the Alliance has appeared. At Exeter Hall the Rev. Mr Preston undertook that office. At Norwich a clergyman of the name of Clowes ventured to do the same thing. A member of the Alliance stood up at Wrexham, and made a sort of apology for that body, but what he did with one hand he knocked down most effectually with the other; therefore it can scarcely be said that he rendered any service. At Manchester a gentleman proposed an amendment upon our resolution, but although a most respectable and influential resident of the town, he could not find a seconder for it. Of these 20,000 persons thus assembled, only seven have held up their hands in favour of the Alliance. (Cheers.) But then you will ask what has the Alliance done? I will state to you in a very few words. A meeting was called in Liverpool some time ago, at which it was determined to send out a general invitation for the formation of an Alliance of Evangelical Christians, who could subscribe a certain doctrinal basis, to meet together in a conference in London, for the purpose of forming an œcumenical or universal alliance. Some noise had been made in Scotland in reference to the conduct of the Free Church, and a letter was sent from London by the Anti-Slavery Society to the aggregate committee afterwards assembled in Birmingham, in order to draw their attention to the question of slavery, and calling on them to say whether or not slaveholding ministers from the United States were to be admitted. Then went forth the resolution triumphantly referred to by Dr Candlish in the General Assembly of the Free Church—a resolution asserting that persons who were in the unhappy predicament of slaveholders were not to be invited to the Alliance Conference. The general invitation arrived in America some time before the delegates from the United States left their own country. When the Conference met, between sixty and seventy Americans were present. Let us see what they did. On the morning of the 28th of August, it was proposed as an amendment upon one of the resolutions relating to the general organisation of the Alliance, that slave-

holders should be excluded. What was the fate of that amendment? After a warm discussion, which lasted during the whole of the day, the amendment was handed over to a large committee. Something else took place during the 28th of August. It was this. Thirty-two of the American delegates drew up and signed a document declaring their firm determination not only not to withdraw from communion with the slaveholders of America, but to draw still closer and tighter the cords binding them together, and to cherish the most affectionate intimacy with those slaveholders. This, Sir, I have always contended was enough to open the eyes of the British members of the Alliance. I will read a portion of this protest, which is signed by the most distinguished members of the American delegation, and the least pro-slavery of them, the rest being opposed to any reference to the subject of slavery. What did the Committee do? After sitting for twelve hours on the 29th, they brought up a report merely expressing a hope that the branches of the Alliance would admit to membership only those slaveholders who are such involuntarily, and not for their own interest. I will not stay to remark upon the equal absurdity and impiety of such a report. To talk of an involuntary slaveholder, is to make God the author of the sin he commits; and to say that there are slaveholders in the United States who are so from no fault of their own, is to say that which is notoriously untrue and nonsensical. The report of the committee was adopted, and this resolution—a resolution prohibiting no slaveholder from entering the Alliance, and making special provision for the admission of a certain class of slaveholders—became part and parcel of the proceedings and legislation of the Conference. In this matter that body was guilty of a fearful, a most fearful, compromise, and its members, scores of whom I could name, —voted in defiance of principles which they had deliberately avowed previous to joining the Alliance. Will any one rise in this vast assembly and tell me that the adoption of that resolution was not a deliberate compromise of the convictions and principles of hundreds of the English members of the Alliance? If so, I will tell him that I *know* that it was a compromise, and I will prove it from the lips of the members of that body who have confessed that it was so. (Hear.) This deed was done on Saturday night. The Sabbath meditations of the Americans brought them to the conclusion that the resolution would not do for them, and they determined to go in a body to the Conference on Monday morning, and have it repealed. They did so. One party in the Conference sought to conciliate them, by moving that the obnoxious resolution should be placed among the miscellaneous proceedings of the Conference, and form no part of the general organization. This, however, was not enough. Another party moved, that the whole of the proceedings on the subject of slavery be rescinded. This the British delegates feared to do suddenly, and the result was, that after another day spent in discussion, the whole matter was referred to a committee, to report to the Conference on the 1st September. This committee came up on the Tuesday morning, and counselled that the whole of the documents on the subject of slavery should be struck out of the proceedings of the Alliance, and that the branches to be hereafter formed should be recommended to form their alliances according to the peculiar circumstances of the countries in which they were formed. This counsel was adopted, and the consequence was, that after four days of incessant deliberation, prayer, reading of the Scriptures, and cogitations of committees, the Conference determined to record no opinion on the question of slaveholding, and deliberately refused to exclude slaveholders from their Alliance. (Cries of "Shame.") All this was a concession to the pro-slavery feeling of the American delegates. (Hear, hear.) This being the conduct of the Alliance, there were in London some who deemed it their duty to take the sense of the British public upon the question. A meeting was therefore held in Exeter Hall; we threw wide the doors, made the platform accessible to all. There was not the slightest restriction. Five hundred circulars were sent to the ministers in and around London, and a special invitation to every American delegate to come and defend his conduct and that of the Alliance. The Rev. John Burnet, a Scotsman, took the chair—(cheers)—and a resolution condemnatory of the Alliance was passed unanimously, with the exception of two dissentients. Now, the question is, Is there anything to condemn in the conduct of that Alliance? We have been told that there was no slaveholder in the Alliance. I say there was a slaveholder among them. There was the notorious Dr Smythe from Charleston—(hisses)—a man who, before he entered the Alliance, had been to Ireland, to the town where he was born (Belfast), and had presented himself before the General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church, and had been refused admission. His name was not even mentioned in that Assembly, though he sat there from day to day listening to the proceedings. He thought proper, while there, to utter a foul libel upon our friend Frederick Douglass, which he persisted in, until he received an intimation from a respectable firm that there was such a thing in this country as a law of libel, when he immediately confessed the falsehood of that which he had before asserted. (Cheers.) And yet this man was admitted into the Evangelical Alliance, and his speeches were listened to upon the subject of slavery. As a member of the committee he was at work most indefatigably while in conference, and brought about the result which we are now reviewing. Now what is the charge we bring against that Alliance? It is this, that they deliberately refused to pass any sentence of condemnation upon slavery. The subject was brought before them, and they were bound to entertain it; for, be it remembered that Great Britain and the United States are, amongst all nations in the world, those in which Evangelical religion is most extensively professed. No œcumenical Alliance of Evangelical Christians can be found without special reference to the United States of America. What right, then, had we to expect a judgment condemnatory of slavery by that Alliance? Every right in the world. I know about a hundred men in that Alliance who have stood with me upon anti-slavery platforms, to denounce the pro-slavery character of the American churches. There were leading members of that Alliance who, in 1840 and 1843, in conventions of abolitionists from various parts of the world, voted for resolutions condemning all religious communion with slaveholders. (Cheers.) Sir, among the many who have sought to defend the Alliance, there is one gentleman pre-eminently worthy of respectful notice, and he is the only defender of the Alliance whom I shall, in this occasion, refer to. I could not refer to a writer more respectable or talented, or one whom I more sincerely esteem, and venerate, and love. Upon getting to Scotland, I find that there has been most industriously circulated throughout the country a letter from the Rev. Dr Wardlaw, a letter originally inserted in the *Patriot* newspaper in London. That reverend and respected gentleman, in the first place, expresses his own view of slavery, a view in which I most cordially agree with him. He says—"Sir, I must say, for myself, I will not yield in

my abhorrence of *the infernal system of slavery*, to Garrison, to Thompson, or to any man breathing. It is one of those subjects on which I feel it no small trial of temper to speak or write with patience, and *am strongly tempted to put violence among the virtues.* American slavery, in *all* its *characteristics*, its *bearings*, and its *results, temporal, spiritual*, and *eternal*, I regard as, *of all accursed things on the face of the earth, one of the most accursed.*" Such are the Doctor's sentiments with regard to slavery. What does he say respecting communion with slaveholders? I will hold him to his words, both in Scotland and everywhere:—"Nothing in the condition of the slaveholder can ever be an excuse for our implicating ourselves, more or less, directly or indirectly, in the evil, by any kind, or any measure, either of communion or connivance. If they cannot keep their hands clean, that can be no reason why we should defile ours—why we should defile them even by clasping theirs." This is sound doctrine. This is what we say; this is all for which we contend. We do not ask that any man should speak more strongly of slavery than Dr Wardlaw has spoken in the eloquent passage I first read. Nor do we desire that any man should have less communion with slaveholders than Dr Wardlaw recommends in this passage, in which he declares that there must be no fellowship, and that we must not defile our hands even by clasping theirs. If the Alliance will adopt these words of Dr Wardlaw, I will be as earnest in my commendations of that Alliance as I am now sincere in the condemnation of that body. Were they not discussing for four days whether slaveholders should be excluded? Did they not declare that slaveholders who were not such of their own fault, should be admitted? Did they not pass a resolution, according to the terms of which any slaveholder in the world professing evangelical sentiments might claim to be admitted? The Doctor, nevertheless, goes on to say that the Alliance has been maligned; and he quotes a short passage from a speech of mine in Exeter Hall, in which I spoke of the Alliance "preferring a union with Drs Cox, Emory, Smyth and Olin to the maintenance of principle." I did not, if I recollect right, mention Dr Wardlaw in Exeter Hall, unless to express my deep regret that he should be amongst men who had acted as the Alliance had done. For I was given to understand that the Doctor had in the Conference expressed similar sentiments to those in the letter which now lies before me. I certainly said on that occasion, and say now, that the interests of the slave were abandoned—that the abolition principle was compromised to please the American delegates who were present in that assembly. This I know, and this Dr Wardlaw, I think, must know. He knows that if these sixty American delegates had not been there, there would have been no hesitation in sanctioning the amendment of Mr Hinton. But, be that as it might, he knows that that amendment was rejected. Will he tell you why it was rejected? The Doctor goes on to say—and I hold him to these words also—"if the Alliance does indeed consist, in whole or in part, of 'those who would maintain slavery'—I at once admit the justice of the conclusion to which you yourself have come, that 'no consistent anti-slavery man can remain a member of this so-called Evangelical Alliance.'" I for one would not remain a member of it for one hour. Now, if Dr Wardlaw will abide by these words, he will, when he learns the truth, be no longer a member of the Evangelical Alliance. "If," says he, "in that assembly were those who maintained slavery, I would not remain a member for one hour." Now, I think an Edinburgh audience will do me the justice to say, that I generally undertake to prove what I say. (Cheers.) I think I can put the doctor out of the Alliance to-night. I will prove that he is not, and cannot be, according to his own declaration, a member of the Alliance without falsifying what he has written in his letter. "Show me," says he, "in that Alliance, any who maintains slavery." Dr Olin was a leading member of that Alliance. He now, I believe, fills a high station amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, at a college in the Northern States. Dr Olin was formerly a slaveholding minister of the south. He recently attended a triennial conference of the Episcopal Methodists, and when the question came up whether they should allow a slaveholding bishop to fill his office and discharge the functions while he was a slaveholder, Dr Olin was present, and hear what that leading and venerated member of the Alliance says. In that Episcopal Methodist conference he uttered the following words, which I will read to you, and which I call upon Dr Wardlaw to ponder well. But first of all I must give you the fact which led to the delivery of this speech. In 1844, the Rev. James Andrews was, in the general conference of the Methodist Church, requested to cease from performing the functions of a bishop in that church while he continued a slaveholder. Upon that occasion Dr Olin delivered a speech to the conference of which the following is an extract —"The conference cannot, and ought not, to infringe upon the rights and immunities of the south.' Their "rights and immunities" meaning of course, slaveholding. "If we touch the rights of the south, we shall soon see disunion. Some doubt that they have a right to hold slaves—I DO NOT. Those who doubt that members and ministers in the south have a right to hold slaves by the constitution of the Church may be very good men, BUT THEY ARE BAD METHODISTS. If I believed as they do, I would reform the church, and if I could not do that in a reasonable time, I would do as some of our friends have, secede, and join some other church, or organize a new one to suit myself. I DO NOT BELIEVE SLAVEHOLDING IS A DISQUALIFICATION FOR A BISHOP, and I will never give such a vote. If I have ever seen men possessing the qualification of a Christian minister, the piety, and zeal, and love, and temper, and devotedness of a Christian minister, it has been among slaveholders." (Great laughter.) "I WAS A SLAVEHOLDER AND MINISTER MYSELF, and, had it not been for the fact that the climate did not agree with me, I SHOULD DOUBTLESS HAVE BEEN A SLAVEHOLDER STILL. It would not be good *policy* to pass a vote to exclude slaveholders from the ministry in future; it would not be good for the master of the slave!" Will Dr Wardlaw meet me in Glasgow, and contend that that member of the Evangelical Alliance does not maintain slavery? He will not. Does the Rev. Samuel H. Cox support slavery? Two months before that minister sat in the Conference at Freemasons' Hall, he presided as moderator of the new school General Assembly in the United States. I have here a full report of the proceeding of that Assembly, containing their doings from day to day. Here are upwards of twenty speeches defending slavery from the Bible, abusing abolitionists, and maintaining the sacred right of one man to property in another man. The Rev. Dr Samuel H. Cox, who all agree was the leading and controlling member of the Evangelical Alliance Conference, sat as moderator in that assembly, asked them to send him to the Evangelical Alliance, and assured them that if they did so their honour,

should be safe in his keeping, and if one word was said in that Alliance calculated to tarnish their Christian character, he would walk out of the body, and shake the dust from off his feet. (Cries of "Oh.") He said that the resolution which Dr Candlish referred to in the General Assembly of the Free Church was a resolution, in the first place—I use his own words—"pared down to mean nothing"—that is my opinion too—(hear, and laughter)—and in the next place, "it was only passed at Birmingham, to gratify a foolish whim of John Bull." The slaveholding ministers in this new school Assembly were forty in number, and at the conclusion of the proceedings they passed a vote of thanks to Dr Samuel Hanson Cox, for his conduct in the chair. Allow me to give you one specimen of the speeches made there; I could give you them until twelve o'clock. In the *New York Evangelist*—a paper which professed to give a faithful report of the proceedings at the Ge eral Assembly—I find no word falling from the lips of Dr Samuel Hanson Cox, in reprobation of the sentiments contained in twenty speeches of those reverend defenders of slavery. In that Assembly—of which, bear in mind, Dr Cox was the moderator—the Rev. Mr Campbell made a speech, of which the following is an extract:—"The right of property in man was recognised in the days of Christ, for he said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.'" That is a singular reading of that passage of Scripture. That Christ recognised the right of property in man, for he said, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." He took notice of three different periods in the human race, paradisaical, from the fall to the coming of Christ, and subsequently to that period. God has, during the middle period, recognised the right of property in man, and legislated about it. Whether it began with man or the devil, he was not concerned to know. (Hisses, and great sensation.) But having been found existing, God's govermental actions recognize it. He then referred to the Abrahamic covenant. He did not affirm that God instituted slavery, but having existed, God legislated about it, and gave to Abraham the right of property in man, and based his law relative to circumc sion on the fact, introducing the master and slave into his covenant. (Hisses, and marks of disapprobation.) He then appealed to the New Testament, and asked, if there is any legislation on the subject there? The apostles did legislate about it, not to approve or authorise it, but to regulate it until it could be put away. They talk about masters and servants, and give directions how the one should treat his slaves, when they demean themselves towards their masters. Here is legislation. No such legislation, however, is to be found on the subject of polygamy in the New Testament. Christ has especially condemned it. Thus, if Christ and the apostles thus legislate about the right of property in man, how could it be a *malum in se?*" Similar language to this was employed by twenty other speakers at the General Assembly. Well, Dr Cox was a member of the Evangelical Alliance; and yet Dr Wardlaw says, "If any portion of the Alliance maintain slavery, I for one will not belong to it." Take then another specimen of the Alliance. The Rev. Mr Clowes, a clergyman of the Church of England, came forward at Norwich, to defend the Alliance, and in my presence declared, "that if his father had left him slaves he would have kept a powerful hold over them for the good of their souls." (Hear.) Take again the president of the Alliance, Sir Culling Eardly Smith. That gentleman, on being questioned in a public meeting at Aylesburgh, boldly said that one of the most christian-minded members of the Alliance was a Brazilian mining slaveholder, and an intimate friend of his, and so highly did he esteem his christian character that he would sooner abandon the Alliance than cease to hold christian fellowship with that slaveholder. Take the Rev. Mr Ewbank, another member of the Alliance, who, in reply to Dr Wardlaw, distinctly advocates the admission of slaveholders, Who then are we to take as trustworthy exponents of the principles of the Alliance? and how can Dr Wardlaw belong to it when he finds fellow members advocating such views as those which I have brought before you? Is not my rev. friend bound by his own letter to come out from the Alliance? (Cheers.) Does he say, no slaveholder ought to belong to the Alliance? Then let him turn to the document which was drawn up by thirty-two members of that Alliance upon the 28th of August, when he was there; upon the very day when he delivered his own sentiments in the Alliance. I will read a few words:—"It is because we have great confidence in the piety and intelligence, and in the constantly increasing number of godly men in the slaveholding states, that we look with increasing hope to the entire removal of American slavery." A strange inference that! "We deeply sympathize with those brethren under the heavy responsibility they are called to bear. Our duty, no less than our Christian affection, impels us to maintain intimate relations with them, and we could not, without a grievous offence against the best hopes of religion and humanity in the South, as well as against our own consciences, consent to any action which would imply a want of Christian confidence in them, or which might endanger our amicable and fraternal relations with this portion of the American Church." Now, that is a document issued by thirty-two members of the Alliance. Is not Dr Wardlaw bound to come out from that body? Sir, I think, without multiplying passages, that I have proved that there were those in the Alliance who did maintain slavery. I am ready to confirm what Mr Garrison has said, that out of sixty or seventy American delegates who came to this country, there were not above six of them who would be regarded as abolitionists in the United States, or as aught but practical enemies to the abolition movement. And yet Dr Wardlaw says, in another part of his letter—"Our American brethren who were with us are anti-slavery men like ourselves." Now, sir, of what importance are the doings of the Alliance upon the question of slavery? Of great importance. What has transpired since the Alliance? The Free Church of Scotland has claimed the Alliance as its own. The Free Church of Scotland has boldly declared, through her organs, that herself and the Alliance are one; ergo—and it is a very modest assertion—the voice of Christendom is in favour of the views of the Free Church. Some years ago, I had a long discussion in Dr Wardlaw's chapel with the Rev. J. Breckenridge. That gentleman then delivered such horrid sentiments, that Dr Wardlaw himself made a long speech in entering his protest against them. This very Dr Breckenridge rose in the Old School General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, with which the Free Church of Scotland is in full communion, and stated, "The Free Church of Scotland occupied precisely the same ground that we do upon the question of slavery; and the time would come when the Presbyterian Church throughout the world will advance to the same position as the General Assembly of the Free Church. [Mr T. then read the proceedings of the meeting at which Dr Breckenridge had made this statement—the substance of which will be gathered from the following remarks.] Now, sir, I beg this Assembly, individually, to note what

degree of notice is taken of the proceedings I have now read, by the organs of the Free Church in Scotland. Let us see if the *Witness* and *Scottish Guardian* will publish these doings of the Old School Assembly of the United States. If they do, mark well the observations they make upon them. And this is the Assembly with which the Free Church is in close fellowship. This body, which PUBLICLY BOASTS OF HAVING EXCLUDED ABOLITIONISTS, WHICH DECLARES IT HAS NO AUTHORITY OVER SLAVERY, WHICH INDEFINITELY POSTPONES ITS ANSWER TO THE LETTER AGAINST SLAVERY FROM THE SYNOD OF CANADA, WHICH SAYS SLAVEHOLDING IS NOT SCRIPTURALLY A TERM OF COMMUNION, AND WHICH DOES NOT DEIGN TO TAKE NOTICE OF THE LETTER FROM THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT IS THE BODY WITH WHICH THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IS IN FULL COMMUNION. Now, I ask this Christian audience if there is not great danger to be apprehended to the anti-slavery cause from the measures adopted in this country on the subject of slavery by the Free Church. Had the Free Church of Scotland gone right on the question of slavery, the Evangelical Alliance would have gone right also. Certain members of that Free Church of Scotland went up to London determined that the Evangelical Alliance should do nothing on the question of slavery, or if they did anything, they should compromise that holy question, and act as they have done. They and their American brethren have triumphed; but we appeal from the Free Church of Scotland to the free people of Scotland. (Cheers.) From the Evangelical Alliance of England to the people of England, and we say to you, You must not put your trust in these bodies. Let the cause of the slave be taken up by you. Let the anti-slavery character of both be vindicated by you, and in your individual character do what you can to arouse both the one and the other from the domination to which they have subjected themselves, by an alliance with slavery. It is said by Dr Wardlaw, that they have not to do with slaveholding, because in fact there is no Evangelical Alliance. He says we have now no Evangelical Alliance. We formed no Evangelical Alliance, because we would not admit slaveholders; but Dr Wardlaw cannot deny that they refused to denounce slaveholding. They refused to make slaveholding a disqualification. The very last resolution passed by that body recommended these very American brethren to go home, and form branch alliances suited to the peculiar circumstances of the country in which they live. Arguing from this, as I think we are bound to do, especially after what we have seen in the reports of the Evangelical Alliance meetings, that there is danger of the churches in England becoming corrupt and contaminated by slavery, we make our appeal. Happy shall I be to find that they have formed another British Alliance, out of which all menstealers will be excluded. I shall be rejoiced, if upon the 4th of November, among the variety of proceedings which will then be adopted, there shall be a resolution that no slaveholder shall become a member of that Alliance. (Cheers.) It is unnecessary for me to say, that, in opposing both the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church, I am no enemy to religion. Is it necessary for me to deny that I am influenced by a spirit of irreligion or personal feeling in the matter? Not at all. Did I believe that body to be as anti-slavery as Dr Wardlaw believes it to be, why, I have, of all other men, to commend their conduct, as well as that of the Free Church of Scotland. It is because the Evangelical Alliance has acted like the Free Church, and given up the interests of the slave in order that they might preserve an unhallowed union with slaveholders, that I condemn them. Mr Thompson concluded a long and able speech, amidst much applause, by expressing a hope of having an opportunity of attending another meeting next week. He then proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which having been cordially carried, the meeting separated.

Glasgow Argus Oct 29/46

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

GREAT PUBLIC MEETING.

A LARGE and most important meeting was held last night in the City Hall, for the purpose of hearing addresses from Messrs. Garrison, G. Thompson, and Douglass, upon the subject of the pro-slavery action of the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church of Scotland, with reference to American slavery, and more particularly in reply to the apologetical letter of the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw on behalf of the former body. Notwithstanding the occurrence of the important meeting in the Trades' Hall, upon the same evening, on the interesting subject of changing the present mode of assessment of the poors'-rate, which is now found to operate so obnoxiously,—the City Hall was crowded in every part, floor and galleries, not less than 4000 persons being present.

Among the gentlemen present were—Councillor Turner, C. Mackay, Esq. L.L.D. the Rev. Mr. Rose, and Dr. Watson, Messrs. Andrew Paton, Thomas Barr, J. B. Ross, Reid, E. Anderson, Dunn, Stewart, Caird, Cairns, Smeal, Murray, Johnstone, &c.

ANDREW PATON, Esq. having been called to the chair, stated that the Glasgow Emancipation Society had convened the present meeting for the purpose of laying before the public of Glasgow the position of the Evangelical Alliance upon the question of slavery and slaveholders. They were desirous of doing that with perfect consistency, candour, and good feeling. It was needless to say that the action of such a body as the Evangelical Alliance was of the utmost consequence in influencing the abolition of the slaves. It had been the object of the abolitionists of Great Britain, America, and the world, to declare the broad principle that slaveholding, under all circumstances, with whatever palliative circumstances the case might be attended, was a sin; and that it was unlawful to have fellowship with slaveholders. The Glasgow Emancipation Society were of opinion that the Evangelical Alliance had infringed that great principle, and they wished to lay before the public at large, clearly and unmistakeably, the action of the Evangelical Alliance upon the subject. Upon this point the meeting would first be addressed by Mr. William Lloyd Garrison—[loud cheering]—a gentleman who had come to England upon the present occasion, not with any expectation of interfering in the slightest degree with the Evangelical Alliance; but the circumstances which had since occurred had compelled him to review the proceedings of that body, and to point out the influence which it would have upon the interests of the three millions of slaves whom he represented. Mr. Garrison had been in Glasgow some short time ago, when it was supposed he would have left England for America in a few days; but he had subsequently been induced, at the urgent solicitation of the friends of abolition in various towns in Great Britain, to remain—to postpone his voyage back to America. The delay in his departure had been most fortunate, as it gave

that gentleman an opportunity of replying to the attacks of those enemies who had lately been so active in maligning him. Mr. George Thompson would also reply to the letter of their respected townsman, the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw; and although Mr. G. Thompson would perform that task thoroughly, he (the Chairman) had no doubt he would do so with the most perfect good taste, and the very best intentions. [Cheers.]

Mr. Garrison, upon rising, was received with cheers. He said, when he last had the honour of appearing upon that platform, he supposed it would have been his farewell interview with them; but if there was one place more than another upon that side of the Atlantic where he would wish to stand, it was in Glasgow, and before a Glasgow audience. [Cheers.] He said so with all sincerity; for while the anti-slavery spirit had died out in England after the emancipation of the West Indian slaves, it never for a single hour was dimmed in its brilliancy and power in Glasgow, or upon the Scottish soil; but he had since been induced to stay a fortnight longer in England, and he only wished that he had gone through the fatigues and exposure of crossing the Atlantic, and that he might have the power of being with them again in Glasgow, and then back again upon the other side of the Atlantic immediately after his speech was closed. He had recently visited various parts of Scotland, England, Ireland, and Wales, and was happy to say that wherever he had been with his respected friends, Messrs. G. Thompson and Douglass, the public sentiment had been heartily concurred in the principles they had laid before then, and which had been unhesitatingly ratified; in every place, although the platforms were free for all who chose to address those meetings in defence of the Free Church or the Alliance. But they had also been met with bitter and malevolent opposition, not openly or where they could get hold of it, but behind their backs. Charges which their enemies dared not make before their faces were sent forth upon the wings of the press, whispering silently into the ears of the people in private meetings. He solemnly declared, after an eighteen years' Anti-Slavery experience in the United States of America, that he had seen nothing more wicked or malicious, more wanton and cruel, than he had beheld within the last three or four weeks emanating from the apologists of the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance. He had gone east and west, north and south, trying to find those calumniators, and to get them face to face before the people, to let the public return a verdict upon the subject; but no, they were among the missing until himself and his friends were off, and then these slanderers were as valiant as any body who could be imagined. If there were any one present prepared to prefer charges against them, the platform was open for them if they would make themselves manifest, and no one would more gladly listen to them than himself. What was the cause of the malignant assault upon himself personally, and the noble body of anti-slavery men and women in the United States, whom he himself represented upon that occasion? Was it that he was a different man from what he was ten years ago, or even six years ago, when he came over to that country, and received the applause of the very men who were then reviling him? Now, was it the abolitionists of the United States had compromised the cause of emancipation, or were even found faltering? No vile charge was ever uttered against them. Whatever sentiments he formerly held upon the subject of American slavery,—whatever religious sentiments he maintained at that time, are held also at the period when he stood up in Dr. Wardlaw's chapel, was welcomed to the platform by the Rev. Dr. himself, and eulogised by him for his faithful efforts in the cause of bleeding humanity. [Cheers.] There was some cause for all the change which had taken place, unfortunately the Free Church of Scotland sent a delegation to the United States of America, and they had established a Christian relationship with the slaveholders of America. They had received the money of men-stealers, and in return recognised those men-stealers as Christian brethren. The Free Church of Scotland had thus assumed a Pro-Slavery position;—it would not recede from that position, but was determined to stand to it, let the consequences be what they might. It was natural that they should stand forward and reprove the criminal action of that body. They were misrepresenting, resorting to falsehoods, libels, raising new and false issues before the people, and trying to throw dust in their eyes, because the Anti-Slavery position of the Free Church was indefensible. The Evangelical Alliance had also taken a Pro-Slavery action, and had proved itself to be an unprincipled body, false to the millions of the human race who were living without rights, deprived of the Bible, without God, and without hope in the world; and in order not to offend those tyrants who were thus stripping their fellow-men of all their rights, they concluded that nothing should be stated against the supporters and friends of slavery in America. The unprincipled partizans of the Alliance, knowing they could not vindicate it in its guilt, were engaged in maligning the true-hearted Abolitionists of the United States. They had endeavoured to excite the religious prejudices of the people of Scotland. His (Mr. Garrison's) only Infidelity was, to denounce the Alliance as a body of men worthy of reprobation for their Pro-Slavery conduct, who had played into the hands of the American slave speculators. [Applause.] Was Dr. Chalmers an Infidel? If he ridiculed and repudiated the Alliance, would they declare him to be an Infidel? And yet what did he say?

"I have no thought that the Evangelical Alliance will keep together; for a thousand Christian ministers have been sent up to London to pray for union, while, notwithstanding all their prayers for such a consummation, they have separated without making one single effort by way of fulfilling the last injunction of the Saviour, by "going unto all the world and preaching the Gospel to every creature." Unless the Alliance gets something to put their hands to,—unless they adopt and carry out some really practical measure,—their meeting in London will descend to a mere theatrical exhibition which cockneys generally admire, and who are ready to exclaim, 'Oh! is it not beautiful!' and 'Is it not grand!' This will not do. I am for something of a substantial nature. If it could have been reported that they had agreed to a particular course of action, that would have been something gratifying; but no such report was ever furnished. If the sixteen ministers who went up to London from this city had returned warm from the Evangelical Alliance with some plan of action for their respective congregations, in uniting together in one great and common effort for Christianising the people around them, I say this would have been a trophy. If it is all to be mere speechifying, I predict that it will be a perfect futility; it will come to nothing at all, and be looked upon as a mere London gathering. It was absurd in the Evangelical Alliance to meet, profess, and pray, and after all to do nothing."

Let the meeting observe that it was the fanatical, disorganising, infidel Dr. Chalmers who thus dared to repudiate the Evangelical Alliance before the world, not upon the ground of its pro-slavery alone, he was sorry to say, but upon other grounds. He would give them also the testimony of the Rev. Dr. Andrew Reed, of London, for he was desirous of placing before them documentary evidence. The Doctor, in a letter in the last number of the *Patriot*, had assigned his reasons for withdrawing from the Alliance. [Mr. Garrison here read the extract from the letter of Dr. Andrew Reed, which will be found in the speech of Mr. G. Thompson.] All honour to Dr. Andrew Reed! Such were the charges they had to bring against the Evangelical Alliance—a body who had proved that they had no flesh in their breasts, and who, with some exceptions to the contrary, thought more of propitiating slave-holders, slave-buyers, and slave-drivers in America, than of faithfully proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ to the world. [Cheers.] There were men in America who professed to be abolitionists, but gradualism was their word. The friends of the slave had then another issue raised, and the abolitionists had to meet a conspiracy organised by slaveholders for the purpose of banishing the coloured population of Africa; that was a conspiracy of a colossal size, and the struggle was long, but at length they succeeded in overthrowing the machinations of the Colonisation Society of America. It argued a great deal of brass, to be sure, for men to raise a hue and cry about infidelity whose hands were stained with human blood—who were buying and selling the image of God in the market—who prevented the gospel of Christ from being preached, also made it a penal offence to give the Bible to the slave, and who were for cutting the throats of those who said aught against the system. The same artifices were now resorted to in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, to cover with infamy the faithful friends of human liberty. The

partisans of the Free Church were crying "Infidel, infidel, infidel;" and the advocates of the Evangelical Alliance also took up the same cry, and endeavoured to operate upon the minds of the people without any reason, without any appeal to their judgment, in the most wicked manner, in the vain hope of diverting attention from the pro-slavery conduct of those bodies. The friends of liberty, however, in Great Britain and America had determined to give the supporters of slavery no rest till the system was utterly abolished. The only charge upon which his (Mr. G.'s) calumniators had ventured to place their finger was in regard to his religious views upon the question of the Sabbath. It would not be right, upon an anti-slavery platform, to go into the Sabbatical question. He himself had invariably objected to the introduction of such questions upon such occasions, the desire of the abolitionists being invariably to keep to their one object; but he would merely say upon that point that he had the misfortune, guilt, or criminality to agree with Martin Luther, John Calvin, Philip Melancthon, William Tyndale, the first translator of the New Testament into English, George Fox, Robert Barclay, the Augsburg Confession of Faith, and so forth, whose sentiments upon the Sabbath he conscientiously endorsed. He (Mr. Garrison) conscientiously agreed with them, that under the present Christian dispensation there has been no letting down of the moral standard, but a lifting of it up, so that, instead of one day being regarded by the human race as peculiarly sacred, let all Christians in Christ Jesus say, that they regard all time as dedicated to God, and that upon all days they should do nothing but what was in exact accordance with the will of their Heavenly Father. [Cheers.] He made that statement in order that it might be clearly understood what his views were upon that particular question, and that there might be no mistake respecting those undefined charges which were brought against him concerning the Sabbath. It mattered not, however, for he was willing to take all those charges and calumnies, and bind them as roses around his brow, as the best witnesses of his fidelity to the cause of human liberty. [Loud cheers.] Wherever he went the cry was "infidel," but so they called the prophets of old, and by that name they denominated Jesus himself, saying that he was a blasphemer, and had a devil; and then, to add to the enormity of his sins, they cried out against him, "This man keepeth not the Sabbath Day." [Cheers.] The very identical words of the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees have descended from that old brood of vipers who stung Jesus to death, and are now found in use in our own days. [Great cheering.] The men who "endeavoured" to get up religious tests upon anti-slavery platforms were men who wanted to perpetuate slavery, and not to abolish it. Was the temperance cause a Baptist, Presbyterian, Unitarian, or Quaker movement? In all those things it overleaped all sectarian barriers, and those who wanted the use of alcohol to be eradicated from the earth, whatever their religious views, united together with one heart and hand. If any man had then attempted to force his peculiar dogmas upon the rest of the society, he would be deemed an enemy in the camp—a wolf in sheep's clothing. The same with the peace question and the organisation of the Anti-Corn Law League. There were the people, and there was the common ground upon which all might labour. It was pleasant in the wilderness of this world, occasionally at least, to find an oasis—some green spot upon which they might meet and recognise each other as brother men. Would that they might be multiplied until there was not merely one green spot! Mr. Garrison concluded a long and most able speech amidst the enthusiastic cheers of his auditors. A press of matter in addition to the meeting, having been extended until near our time of going to press, prevents our giving more than the above outline.

Mr. Douglass then having been called for, gave some interesting and luminous descriptions of the manner in which some slaves had effected their escape.

Mr. George Thompson rose and said—I appear before this meeting to discharge a special and specific duty, and I shall not suffer myself to be diverted from my object by the numerous malevolent attacks which have been made upon me and my friends, in consequence of the course we have been compelled by our consciences to pursue, in relation to the conduct of the Free Church of Scotland and the Evangelical Alliance, on the subject of American slavery. For myself, I am content to leave my motives to be judged of by a reference to my past life. I can honestly declare, that the advancement of the cause of truth and freedom is the only object I have in view, and that I seek that object solely by such means as Christianity sanctions. The fact that the part I have for some time been taking in the present controversy has cost me the good opinion of many whose friendship I have been wont to value most highly, must, I think, demonstrate to every impartial mind, that it is not popularity, or any personal object, that I am in pursuit of. It is my intention, to-night, to abstain as much as possible from the utterance of my own opinions. I am anxious to use the time allotted to me in laying before you certain historical facts, which I think it of importance you should be aware of; and certain evidence, also, which may enable you to arrive at a sound and accurate conclusion upon the questions at issue. I shall in the first place direct your attention to the present position of the Free Church; next, to the conduct of the Evangelical Alliance; and finally, to the letter of the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw. [Cheers.] The conduct of the Free Church in relation to American slavery is well known. After the disruption of 1843, a deputation consisting of the Rev. Dr. Cunningham and others, was sent to the United States to awaken the sympathies of the churches there, on behalf of the ministers and people of Scotland, who, for conscience sake, had separated from the Church of Scotland. In the words of a pamphlet put forth by the Free Church, containing a revised report of the proceedings of the General Assembly, on Saturday, May 30, and June 1, 1846:—"The deputies to America had much friendly intercourse with Christians of all denominations, and particularly with the Presbyterian Churches. They had no scruple in this, although they were aware that these churches did not act upon the rule of excluding slaveholders from communion; and upon this principle, when they went to the Southern States, they did not hesitate to cultivate the acquaintance of ministers and congregations of the Presbyterian Churches there, notwithstanding the admitted fact that slaveholders might be members. Both before the visit of the deputies, and through their means, considerable sums were sent to this country by congregations and private Christians in America, including the Southern as well as the Northern States. Thus, this church was brought into connection with the Churches of America, whose sympathy and liberality she experienced." This, I admit, is a true history of the affair, and its authority will not be denied. [Cheers.] The facts, then, are these. Before the deputies were sent to America, money had been sent from the slaveholding churches of the South to the Free Church, and had been received. The deputies themselves "were aware" that the members of the Southern Churches were "slaveholders;" but they had "no scruple" on this point, but "upon principle" went among them, and "did not hesitate" to "cultivate their acquaintance," and take their money. Such is the candid confession of the Free Church herself. Now, let me carry you to the United States, and into the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, before which Messrs. Lewis and Chalmers appeared, as the representatives of the Free Church. I quote from a pamphlet, containing extracts from the volume of Mr. Lewis, entitled, "Slavery and Slaveholders in the United States." Mr. Lewis arrived in Louisville, Kentucky, in time to attend the sittings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The reception of the deputation by the Assembly was most cordial. "But as much," says Mr. Lewis, "as our hearts were gladdened by this kindly welcome, so much more were we cast down by the reception which the Assembly gave to the question of slavery. An overture came up from some of the Presbyteries of the Free States, and an attempt was made to bring on a discussion; but the discussion was refused by a majority of 117 to 69. The Southern members, when they heard of the intention of bringing the matter forward, gave notice in open Assembly that they would hold a *caucus*, the name given in the States to an extraordinary political meeting, in the gallery, after the Assembly dismissed. So strong is the feeling on the part of the Southern ministers, that one of them, the most popular preacher in the Slave States, declared privately to a friend, that if slavery were abolished he would go to Texas—for what purpose, unless to enjoy the luxury of being served by slaves?—a singular proof of the attachment in the Slave States to slavery, when a minister of the gospel could

thus speak to a brother minister:" p.p. 13 14. Such was the General Assembly in which the deputies took their seats as representatives of the *Free* Church! The very discussion, even, of the question of slavery, prohibited by a vote of 117 to 69! In another part of his work, Mr. Lewis tells us, that the question of slavery was "tabooed." In the Free Presbytery of Dundee, Mr. Lewis stood up and confessed to his brethren, that "the moment the ministers of the Southern States spoke out on the subject of slavery, their usefulness would be destroyed; indeed, the moment I myself had spoken out, I would have been turned out of the country." Such was the position of the Free Church deputation in America. On page 49 he says,—"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church some years ago voted slavery to be 'a great moral evil;' but no practical step has yet been taken by it, as a Church, towards its extinction, although many such lie open before it. If unprepared for the step of the Associate Reformed Synod, or even of the Methodist body, there lies at the door, crying for redress, not only the sin of slavery itself, but the fruits of the sin of slavery—in the separation of husband from wife, still legal—of parents from children—the legal nullity of the marriage relation—and the abominable legal prohibition, in many States, to teach the negro to read or write. All these things lie unprotested against by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, though this last is a plain violation of its freedom as a Church. On these subjects they have never once approached the legislature, or sought to rouse the moral sentiments of their congregations." Such was the body with which, deliberately, and with their eyes wide open, the Free Church of Scotland voluntarily united itself. Such were the men they brought into full communion with themselves. Such were the men from whom they admit they received £3000, obtained by violence and wrong, from the miserable human beings to whom these tyrants, according to his own statement, denied, not only liberty, but the rights of consanguinity, the marriage relation, and the power as well as the right to read the Word of God. Oh, most horrible compact! and yet the men who denounce this agreement are called "infidels." Infidels! who would give the Bible to the slave: who would prevent the separation of parents from children; who would sanctify the marriage contract; who would save the Church of Christ from pollution; who would raise men from the condition of brutes, and restore them to themselves, and show them the paths which lead to liberty and life eternal. Such, sir, is our infidelity — our enemies being judges; for the worst crime they can lay to the charge of the devoted champion of American freedom now amongst us, is, that he rejoices in the decline of that religion, "which voluntarily comes forth to baptize and sanctify slavery;" while they, by their condemnation of this truly Christian sentiment, proclaim to the world that they rejoice in the spread and prosperity of such a religion. Let the world judge between them, and decide who is the true Christian. We have seen that, according to the confession of Mr. Lewis, a faithful testimony on the subject of slavery, would have led to his being turned out of the country. And yet, the men who would have turned him out of the country, tell the Free Church through their Moderator—I quote from the answer to the letter of the Free Church of October 28th, 1844—"Your messengers were most welcome. Their enlightened minds, warm affections, and Christian candour, won our hearts, and excited stronger desires than ever to form with you a fellowship, intimate and lasting." Christian candour! The candour that closed its lips on the subject of slavery! A fellowship, "intimate and lasting," between the Free Church and those who would have turned her deputies out of the country, if they had spoken out on the question of slavery! Sir, we have heard much from the lips of Free Churchmen, respecting the probable efficacy of kind and affectionate remonstrances with the churches on the other side of the Atlantic. The abolitionists are accused of doing injury by their violence and vituperation. They are an infidel body of men and women, to whom it is not to be expected that a reverend assembly, like the General Assembly of the United States, will listen. The consciences and intellects of Christian ministers and elders, are only to be reached by the efforts of holy and temperate men, like the members of the Free Church Assembly. Let me, then, carry you at once into the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterians, which met at Philadelphia in May last. I am extremely anxious that the particulars I am now about to state, should be accurately reported, and widely circulated throughout this country. I care not in what estimation my own opinions may be held; I am only solicitous that the solemn facts and indisputable evidence in which I am dealing to-night, should go forth to the christian world. The *New York Observer*,—whose Editor, Mr. Sidney E. Morse is a Presbyterian, and a member of the Evangelical Alliance, and who is the writer of a long letter to the Edinburgh *Witness*, abusing the abolitionists of America, [See *Witness*, July, 8s] the *New York Observer*, a paper as thoroughly proslavery as any to be found on either side of the Atlantic, has published a report of the doings of the old school General Assembly, with which the Free Church of Scotland is in full communion. This body met in the City of Philadelphia, on the 21st of May last, at the very time, be it remembered, that the leaders of the Free Church Assembly were making speeches at Canon Mills, in favour of the piety, orthodoxy, and sound anti-slavery views of their transatlantic brethren, and predicting, also, the beneficial results of their own fraternal intercourse with those brethren. To this old school Assembly there were several communications sent on the subject of slavery, all of them from ecclesiastical bodies in correspondence with that Assembly. Among these, was a letter from the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, another from the Free Church Synod of Canada, and two from the General Associations of Massachusetts and Connecticut. I am very sorry I have not been able to obtain the letter sent by the branch of the Free Church in Canada, and I take this opportunity of saying, that I shall feel greatly obliged to any friend in this city, or elsewhere, who will send me the document. When this letter was brought forward by the stated clerk, "its reading, for a time," we are told in the report, "was *endured*, but it was quite too much. Very soon the clerk stammered and hesitated, and pretended the writing was so bad that he could not well read it; and Dr. Musgrove, of Baltimore, in Maryland, (a slave state) *having lost all patience*, moved to arrest the reading, on account of its *indecorous* and *abusive* language." That is to say, it was a plain and faithful remonstrance on the subject of slavery. I will venture to affirm, without having seen the letter, that it was a calm, respectful, Scriptural, and Christian-minded document, and utterly undeserving of being characterised by the name of outrageous or indecorous. After this motion, the following discussion, according to the report in the *Observer*, took place. Another American paper assures us, that the temper of the discussion has been very much improved by the reporter. Be that as it may, the report I am now about to read will, if I am not grievously mistaken, open the eyes of all honest members of the Free Church of Scotland, to whose serious and impartial attention I submit, what I fear neither the *Witness*, the *Guardian*, nor the *Warder* will publish:—"Dr. R. J. Breckinridge rose—This is the gentleman with whom, more than ten years ago, I had a discussion in this city. And here I beg to quote the language of Dr. Wardlaw, in reference to that discussion. In a speech, delivered at a meeting to review the debate, and pronounce an opinion upon its merits, Dr. Wardlaw said.—'There is but one other point to which I wish to advert. Mr. Thompson had given us, before the late discussion, very affecting, humbling, shocking details, in proof that, in America, slavery was, to a sad extent, the sin of the Church. Now, Sir, if there was any one point on which, more than on the rest, Mr. T. was *successful in establishing his statements*, and clearing himself from every imputation of injustice, unfairness, and exaggeration, *this was that point*. The documentary evidence adduced on the last night of the controversy contained disclosures which *gave him an appalling triumph*. I could not but be pleased to see our friend so successfully vindicate his integrity; but oh! the satisfaction was fearfully darkened by the nature of the facts! To *vindicate the ministers and churches* of America was avowed as one of Mr. Breckenridge's principal objects. *In no point did he more signally fail*. The defence was feeble, inefficient, and fruitless. *The facts against him were overwhelming*.'" But to return to the discussion in the American General Assembly. "Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, hoped the second reading would go on."

"Mr. Watt, from Alabama, (a slave state,) thought we should show that we can listen with undisturbed calmness to all that might be said on the subject."

"Mr. Reynolds, from Tennessee, (a slave state,) wished to show courtesy to all, but could not think it was our duty to allow ourselves to be abused to our face."

"A member said, we read that if the righteous smite us, it shall be a kindness, and an excellent oil, which shall not break the skin of our head. Now we might put our foot on this Synod, (the Free Church Synod of Canada,) but this was a respectable body of Christians; this was a church, a Presbyterian Church, an old school, true blue Presbyterian Church. The question was, whether we should permit the righteous to smite us, and whether their reproof in our case was to prove an excellent oil."

"Dr. R. J. Breckinridge said, we owe it to ourselves to pursue a dignified course, to hear with calmness whatever might be said on this subject. The more abusive language is, the more it becomes us to listen with patience. To refuse to hear would be a committal of this house to a rupture with a body with whom we have been in fraternal correspondence. But suppose that church should write a letter which would be a ground for breaking up the correspondence, should we not hear it? The whole thing would be open for any disposition the Assembly might see fit to make of it, after hearing the letter. We might answer, or we might not.

"Dr. Musgrave wished to explain. Personally he thought he had as much patience as most of his brethren. But we, as a public body, must take a stand somewhere in resisting the assaults made upon us. He had no doubt the Abolitionists were in correspondence with some of these foreign bodies. They (the abolitionists) had been excluded from this house; and now, through these channels, under the cover of courtesy, they were seeking to obtain a hearing. He thought it was due to the South to refuse them the opportunity. In regard to what had been said about the righteous smiting us, he would say that he should rejoice in it, if satisfied that they are righteous, that the rebuke is called for and administered in a Christian spirit. There was no novelty in referring papers without reading. True decorum requires that we should refuse to listen to those who treat us not only discourteously, but outrageously. I think I understand the evil of slavery, and therefore I wish to keep it out of this body.

"Dr. Musgrave had leave to withdraw his motion: the reading was concluded, and it was moved to refer the paper to the Committee on Correspondence, to be answered.

"Dr. Young could not conceive any reason that they (the Free Church Synod) had for insulting us. He thought that we ought to hear kindly; that self-respect requires us to listen. It is *primâ facie* evidence that a man had some distrust of his principles or position, if he cannot endure to hear them called in question. The man that is in the right can afford to be abused. He therefore advocated the hearing of the paper.

"Dr. W. L. Breckinridge was opposed to this reference. It seemed to open the way for, and to invite, all kinds of people, all over the world, if they saw fit, to come and lecture this body. We might have to hear Mormons, and Quakers, &c. If I were the stated clerk, I should not wish to be the channel of such communications.

"Dr. M'Farlane was glad to have heard the paper through. That body is a Christian body—a useful body—but it was evident they had a morbid sensibility on this subject. He thought that we should not spread this communication on our minutes, to go to our churches. He would be in favour of returning the communication. Our self-respect, he thought, would not allow us to retain it, and that Synod should be informed that the correspondence must be different, or cease altogether.

"Rev. Mr. Wilson of Cincinnati, was also glad that the letter had been read through. He supposed that we now have great doubts as to the expediency of continuing the correspondence. He would like to see a preamble and resolution setting forth that, inasmuch as the body from whom this communication comes intimates doubts as to the propriety of continuing it, we at once declare it altogether inexpedient and undesirable. We should but take them at their word. When the smoke and dust of conflict on this subject have cleared away, they would see their error. They were now profoundly ignorant on the matter to which their communication referred.

"Mr. Fullarton —The question is agitated whether we shall continue this correspondence. By discontinuing it we should cut ourselves off from the sympathy of the whole Christian world. Let us cut ourselves off from this Synod in Canada, and next year we shall have to cut ourselves off from the Free Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, &c. The interest in the subject of slavery, and the investigation it was undergoing in every part of the civilised world, was one of the signs of the times. The South will have to stand alone; and the North will not stand this foreign pressure. In 1834 we had correspondence with the Secession Church of Scotland. We then admitted that we had sinned in this matter. Shall we now unsay all we have said? Shall we go back?"

Let me now request the solemn consideration of all Free Churchmen to the reply given by the notorious Dr. Breckinridge to the remarks of Mr. Fullarton:—

"Dr. R. J. Breckinridge was not prepared to commit himself whether the letter should be answered, or how it should be answered, but he was very clear as to one thing, that the communication should be disposed of in the regular way. He made a great distinction between bodies with whom we are already in correspondence, and such as have no relations with us. It was due to ourselves, to truth, and to them, that this letter should take the usual course. We stand related to the people from whom it comes as near as we possibly can. We have the same confession, the same ancestry, and we are bound to them by solemn covenant. I take leave to say, said Dr. B. that I have carefully examined this subject for many years; and for one, without adopting every expression used in our published proceedings, I think the principles therein involved are to be maintained. I DISSENT from the preceding speaker on one of the most important points advanced by him—viz. the whole Christian world are against us on this subject. THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND OCCUPIES PRECISELY THE SAME GROUND THAT WE DO. *And the time will come when the Presbyterian Church throughout the world will unite on the principles that were advanced by the last Assembly.* Let us do our duty, and let the heavens fall if they have a mind to fall."

The letter was referred to the Committee on Correspondence. Of this committee, R. J. Breckinridge, D.D. was chairman. On the Tuesday following, he, in behalf of the committee, reported an answer. It set forth that the Assembly has no more authority over slavery than the Synod of Canada has over the Popish superstitions which the British government supports in Canada, or the heathen abominations which it pensions in India. It concluded by recommending the discontinuance of the correspondence. The report was laid upon the table, and though called up several times subsequently, was, finally indefinitely postponed. The same committee, June 1st, reported an answer to the letter of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, stating, that on the subject of slavery this church does not feel called on to defend itself against the calumnies of ignorant or corrupt men either at home or abroad, but that the testimony of its churches always has been, that slavery, as an INSTITUTION, is not to be defended, nor can (slaveholding) scripturally be made a term of communion. The answer was accepted and placed on the docket. The same committee reported, that the communication from the General Association of Connecticut be filed, and nothing more be done in regard to it. Besides these communications from foreign bodies, overtures on the subject of slavery were sent to the Assembly from five presbyteries; also a resolution of the Synod of Cincinnati, and a memorial from the first African Church in Philadelphia. These were referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, of which Rev. J. C. Young, D.D. was chairman. The committee, after referring to the action of the Assembly in 1818 and 1845, recommended the adoption of a minute to the effect that "no further action on this subject is needed."

Mr. Thomas said he objected to the report, because he believed it stated what was not true, and for other reasons.

Dr. Young attempted to explain and defend it, maintaining that the Church occupies the same ground now, as far as its testimony is concerned, which it always has occupied.

Mr. Kerr moved an amendment, viz. that the following be added to the minute recommended, "except to say that the action of the Assembly of 1845 is not intended to deny or rescind the sentiments of the Assembly, expressed at different times, prior to this date."

The amendment was lost, and the original report, that *no action is needed*, was adopted by a vote of 119 to 34. The next day, however, on motion of Mr. R. M. White, the following resolution was passed:—"That the Assembly do not consider the action of 1845 as designed to deny or rescind the action of the General Assembly of any previous date."

When all Christendom are awaking and making advances in their views, feelings, and conduct in respect to human slavery, the glory of the Old School Presbyterian Church is, that it stands where it always has stood, and that is on the ground that slavery, as an *institution*, is a bad thing, but that the *individual practice and support* of it is no bar to a regular standing, and by consequence to the highest honours and offices in the church!

A word of comment on the proceedings I have now laid before you is unnecessary. I believe them to produce their legitimate effect upon the friends of all truly christian men. These are the churches, and these the ministers, which the Free Church of Scotland has taken into her communion. These are the professors of the religion of Christ, for whose sake the leaders of the Free Church have let down the law of God. For whose sake they have banded themselves together, to traduce and destroy all who will not recognise such men and churches as acting in accordance with the spirit and precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ. People of Scotland! rise to the rescue of christianity. Speak the word, and for yourselves at least annul the unwholly covenant. Do not dream of influencing these pro-slavery churches by any action short of putting them beyond the pale of your communion. Behold their chafings and anger and fury on the presentation of the letter from a sister church, and yield to the incontestible proof that Ephraim is wedded to his idols. At present you are in that wicked church. Come out of her, lest ye be partakers of her plagues. Touch not, taste not, handle not, the unclean thing. I come now to the Evangelical Alliance, and on this part of the subject I must, for want of time, be very brief, and satisfy myself with a hasty glance at its proceedings. It commenced its sittings on the 19th of August, but the question of slavery was not introduced until the 28th. As I have no controversy on this platform with that body, on any other question than that of slavery, I shall confine myself to its proceedings in connection with that one subject. On the morning of the 28th of August, immediately after devotional exercises, it was moved by Dr. Schmucker and seconded by Dr. Bunting, "that the Alliance shall consist of those persons, in all parts of the world, who shall concur in the principles and objects of the conference. Upon this the Rev. J. H. Hinton moved, and the Rev. J. V. Himes, of the United States, seconded an amendment, that after the words "those persons" the words "not being slaveholders," should be inserted. This amendment threw the Alliance into consternation and alarm. A very warm debate commenced, and was continued until the dinner hour arrived. In the Conference, there were between sixty and seventy delegates from America, and these, we are told, instead of going with their brethren to dinner, went apart by themselves to deliberate and pray. The result of their private intercourse is made know to us by a protest against the introduction into the Conference of the subject of slavery, in the course of which they inform the Conference of their fixed determination to retain fellowship with the slaveholders of the South, and conclude by saying, "Our duty, no less than our Christian affection, impels us to maintain intimate relations with them; and we could not, without a grievous offence against the best hopes of religion and humanity in the South, consent to any action which would imply a want of confidence in them, or which might endanger our amicable and fraternal relations with this portion of the American Church." Sir, no sane or honest man can hesitate for a moment to say, that this protest should at once have decided the course of the Conference. That body was frankly and plainly told, that in receiving the American delegates, they also received the slaveholders of the South. There is no mistake on this point. Here is the proof. "If you take us," say the Americans, "you take our slaveholding brethren too, and more than this; you shall take us on the condition, that nothing which you may do shall imply a want of Christian confidence in them, or endanger our amicable and fraternal relations with them." This unmistakable document is dated Friday, August 28, the very day when the subject came up, and is the fruit of the prayerful inquiry of the American delegates. Late on Saturday night, the question was handed over to a committee of *forty-five*. What did the committee do? After sitting for more than twelve hours on the 29th, they brought up a report merely expressing a hope that branches of the Alliance would admit to membership only those slaveholders who might be such involuntarily, and not for their own interest. I will not stay to remark upon the equal absurdity and impiety of such a report. To talk of an involuntary slaveholder, is to make God the author of the sin he commits; and to say that there are slaveholders in the United States who are so from no fault of their own, is to say that which is notoriously untrue and nonsensical. The report of the committee was adopted, and this resolution—a resolution prohibiting no slaveholder from entering the Alliance, and making special provision for the admission of a certain class of slaveholders—became part and parcel of the proceedings and legislation of the Conference. In this matter that body was, I am prepared either in this city or any other part of the kingdom to maintain, guilty of a fearful, a most fearful, compromise, and that its members, scores of whom I could name,—voted in defiance of principles which they had deliberately avowed, previous to joining the Alliance. Will any one rise in this assembly and tell me that the adoption of that resolution was not a deliberate compromise of the convictions and principles of hundreds of the English members of the Alliance? If so, I will tell him that I *know* that it was a compromise, and I will prove it from the lips of the members of that body who have confessed that it was so. This deed was done on Saturday night. The Sabbath meditations of the Americans brought them to the conclusion that the resolution would not do for them, and they determined to go in a body to the Conference on Monday morning, and have it repealed. They did so. One party in the Conference sought to conciliate them, by moving that the obnoxious resolution should be placed among the miscellaneous proceedings of the Conference, and form no part of the general organisation. This, however, was not enough. Another party moved that the whole of the proceedings on the subject of slavery should be rescinded. This the British delegates feared to do suddenly, and the result was, that after another day spent in discussion, the whole matter was referred to a committee, to report to the Conference on 1st Sept. This committee came up on the Tuesday morning, and counselled that the whole of the documents on the subject of slavery should be struck out of the proceedings of the Alliance, and that the branches to be hereafter formed, should be recommended to form their alliances according to the peculiar circumstances of their particular districts. This counsel was adopted, and the consequence was, that after four days of incessant deliberation, prayer, reading of the Scriptures, and cogitations of committees, the Conference determined to record no opinion on the question of slaveholding, and deliberately refused to exclude slaveholders from their Alliance. I hold in my hand a pamphlet, entitled Abstract of the Proceedings and Final Resolutions of the Conference. It emanates from the committee and office of the Alliance. Not one word of all I have now stated appears in it, although my statements are drawn from the *Acta* of the Alliance, printed daily for the information of the members. I know, it is said, that the resolution of Saturday night the 28th, was rescinded in order that higher anti-slavery ground might be taken. I deliberately and advisedly deny it. A member of the Conference who does not take my side in the present agitation, writing to the *Patriot*, says:—"Whatever grounds of objection may be taken by warm Anti-slavery men in this country [not, mark, in the Conference] to this resolution, the fact was, that still stronger objections were raised by the Americans themselves. No sooner had they time to look deliberately at the terms in which it was expressed, than they convened private meetings of their own

countrymen [on the Sunday], and on Monday morning delivered the most earnest expressions of disapprobation against the entire article. They represented that they could not face their countrymen or churches with such a resolution staring them in the face, and many of them would rather retire from the Alliance than attempt it. In stating their objections to it, the fact came out most glaringly that it was not the unwilling and reluctant, but the entire mass of professing slaveholders with whom they sympathised, and nothing would satisfy them but an entire dropping of all reference to the subject of slavery." This, I am prepared to prove by overwhelming testimony, was the real state of the case. The resolution itself was the first compromise, and the abrogation of it was the second, and the second act was as much a concession to the slave power in the Conference as the first. Here let me quote an authority entitled to considerable respect on this subject. The Rev. Dr. Andrew Reed of London, a member of the Conference, has sent a letter to the Alliance Committee, stating his reasons for withdrawing from that body. He assigns three reasons for the act. The third is in the following words:—

"III. The final reason weighing on my mind connects itself with the question of slavery. Undoubtedly, the Alliance were at liberty to say whether they would deal with that question. They resolved, however, to take action on it; and in my judgment the course pursued is the most objectionable that it was possible to adopt. The Conference resolved unanimously, and under a strange ecstacy of mind, that slavery may be not only legal, but right; not only right, but in certain circumstances beneficial even to the slave. They afterwards met to rescind that resolution; not, be it observed, to meet the wishes of a small British party, who might have thought on reflection, that it yielded too much as against the slave: but to satisfy a controlling party, who thought it yielded too little! And, finally, it stultified itself by agreeing to expunge its own minutes, and to persuade itself and the public, that it had taken no action on a subject on which, in fact, it had been more deeply engaged than any other.

"This, I think, is doing gratuitous and incalculable evil. The subject is introduced, to be trifled with and postponed. The vital interests of the slave are damaged, and, as far as possible, made questionable; and this great country,—made penitent by the grace of Heaven, for the monstrous wrong it had done, and giving evidence to the world of its sincerity, by inflicting on itself a penalty which stands alone in history—is made to take a lower and a most humiliating position before the eyes of all nations, and especially before those of France and America. If good is to be set against evil, the Alliance must realise a larger amount of good than the most sanguine of its friends will readily ascribe to it, to outweigh this enormous evil.

"Every member of the Alliance, as such, is now committed to hold the interests and rights of the bleeding slave in abeyance for years to come; and I cannot be a party to such a contract—*no, not for an hour!* I write this with intense grief. A fine opportunity, purchased, too, at much expense of time, toil, and property, has been lost; and fresh difficulties have been thrown in the way of that Christian Union which shall open its arms to every professing believer in Christ, and for which every kind and gracious spirit is sighing and supplicating."

This is a noble and a timely testimony, for which the slave, the slave's friends, and the God of the oppressed will bless Dr. Reed. Will the *Witness* and the *Free Church Magazine* call Dr. Reed a "bad man" and an "Infidel?" We shall see. He will doubtless be honoured by their abuse, as he was when he seemed to lean too much to the side of the slaveholder—just as I am abused at the present time, for the very conduct which obtained for me the applause of the same men ten years ago. I leave the protest of Dr. Reed, to review the letter of Dr. Wardlaw, and I do so with a sorrowful heart. Nothing in the whole course of this controversy has given me more pain than the appearance of Dr. Wardlaw in defence of the conduct of the Alliance on the subject of slavery; and it is a strange event indeed, to find myself on an anti-slavery platform in the city of Glasgow contending with Dr. Wardlaw on the question of slavery. There is no man in the three kingdoms, or any part of the world, for whom I have entertained a feeling of stronger friendship, or of more profound veneration and respect. I continue to cherish this feeling, and venture to express a hope, that the Doctor will deign to consider the facts I have already stated, and those which I shall further lay before this meeting, assured, that if he will do so, the time will come that there will be no difference of views between us upon the present question. Dr. Wardlaw has addressed a letter to the *Patriot* newspaper, which has been widely circulated by the friends of the Alliance, and also by the organs of the Free Church; albeit, I cannot see what reason the last named parties have for promulgating the views which the letter contains, seeing that, however much it may tend to help the Alliance, it is a severe, a bitter, and a most richly merited reproof of the absurdities and heresies which that body has disseminated on the question of slavery and slaveholding. There are many parts of this letter to which I can, with the utmost cordiality, subscribe. Take, for instance, the Doctor's indignant denunciation of slavery. He says:—

"I must say, for myself, I will not yield, in my abhorrence of the *infernal system* of slavery, to Garrison, to Thompson, or to any man breathing. It is one of those subjects on which I feel it no small *trial of temper* to speak or write with *patience*, and am strongly tempted to *put violence among the virtues*. American slavery, in all its characteristics, its bearings, and its results, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, I regard as, of all accursed things on the face of the earth, one of the most accursed."

This is strong language. The leaders of the Free Church feel very differently upon this subject. They denounce "violence" as anti-Christian, as a sufficient proof of enmity to evangelical religion, and exhibit the utmost amount of patience and philosophy when they talk of slavery. They only lose their tempers and become abusive when they speak of abolitionists. With all my heart I thank Dr. Wardlaw for this passage. He is inclined to pardon, if not to praise, for some excess, where the theme is slavery. I admire, equally as much, the manner in which he speaks of holding communion with slaveholders. He says—Nothing in their condition can ever be an excuse for our implicating ourselves, more or less, directly or indirectly, in the evil by any kind, or any measure, either of communion or of connivance. If they cannot keep their hands clean, that can be no reason why we should defile ours—why we should defile them even by clasping theirs. It is foolish to talk of any difference between the sin of slavery and the sin of slaveholding. Few things can be clearer, than that, were there no slaveholding, there would be no slavery—that, were there no holders of slaves, there would be no slaves. If, therefore, we are to have nothing to do with slavery, we must have nothing to do with slaveholding. They are not only in one category, they are one and the same thing. (Loud cheering.) What will our Free Church friends say to this? What! the wisdom of the General Assembly—the logic of Cunningham, the sophisms and metaphysics of Candlish, and the subtle and casuistical distinctions of Duncan, together with the deliverances of 1844, and 1845, and 1846, all "foolish?" yet, so says Dr. Wardlaw; he also pronounces them "defiled," by having "clasped," as they have boastingly done, the hand of the slaveholder. Hear, too, what he says of future connection with Americans; and again I entreat the Free Church people to give attention to his words:—

"The American brethren, are upon their trial. No act of theirs can become the act of the Alliance, without the recognition of its other branches. If, therefore, they are found to introduce slaveholders into the communion of the Alliance, in their branch of it, we are neither answerable for the act, nor bound by it. The repudiation of the deed will then become our duty, and separation from those by whom the pollution has been wilfully contracted. It will be ours to say, with sorrow, but with firmness, 'We are not responsible for this act of yours. You know our mind. You have done what we cannot recognise and cannot tolerate—we part.' I speak now for myself. I should mourn the day when that plague-spot should appear on the fair hand of our Alliance. That hand, which now I grasp with fond delight, I should fling

indignantly from me: and yet, while with a loathing, not less with a reluctant and aching heart. I should feel myself compelled to say, looking with a tearful eye upon my Transatlantic brethren '*Amicus Cox, amicus Patten, amicus Kirk, amicus Pomeroy—amici ceteri omnes; sed magis amica*—LIBERTAS.'"

But why are the American brethren now upon their trial, and why have they been sent home, expressly "recommended to form District Organizations, in such manner as shall be most in accordance with the peculiar circumstances of each district?" If they are to be condemned hereafter, why were they not condemned on the spot? For four days were the slaveholders of America on their trial before the Conference, yet that Conference deliberately refused to pronounce any opinipn whatever on the character of those men, and fellowshipped those who openly declared their sympathy with them. There is much meaning in the last words of this passage. They are solemn, emphatic, irrevocable, unless there should be a wonderful retrogression in the views of Dr. Wardlaw, a thing I cannot suppose possible. But, the Doctor contends that the Alliance has done its duty, and that it has been undeservedly assailed. At the commencement of his letter he says—"Without touching on any general questions respecting the Evangelical Alliance, the nature of its constitution, the possibilities of its working, or the probabilities of its permanence, may I request a portion of your columns on the one point of slavery? On this point the Alliance has been far from getting justice: it has been maligned." Further on, referring to myself, he says—"I repudiate the charge with deep concern, that a friend, whom I have ever held high in my esteem, should have publicly brought against myself and my British brethren, of 'preferring a union with Drs. Cox, and Smith, and Emory, and Olin, to the maintenance of principle.' I regret to find Mr. Thompson commencing the sentence which contains this unworthy imputation, with the words, 'The truth is.' I say for myself, and I am confident I may say for every member of the Alliance, that it is as far from the truth as possible." I am willing that the proceedings of the Conference should determine whether I was right or wrong. Dr. Wardlaw's charitable opinion cannot effect those proceedings. Again he says: —"The Alliance has given no sanction to slavery or to slaveholding. The charge is a slander. The declaration goes forth to the world that, in consequence of the existence among our Transatlantic brethren of those evils, the Alliance has been actually prevented from forming and settling its general organisation; that these evils have rendered the temporary suspension of this measure necessary; that American Christianity must be subjected to trial in this particular before British Christianity can fully and cordially co-operate with it under one organisation. Is this a sanctioning of slavery? Is this really sufficient to justify such terms of intemperate and reckless abuse as have been heaped indiscriminately on all our heads?" I contend that the refusal to condemn slavery under the circumstances of the conference, was a virtual sanction of the system, or at all events of the conduct of slaveholders. Again:—"If the Alliance does indeed consist, in whole or in part, of those who would maintain slavery, no consistent anti-slavery man can remain a member of it. I, for one, could not remain a member of it for an hour." This passage I will notice presently. Again:—"Our American brethren, who were with us, are anti-slavery men like ourselves."—(This assertion I will presently notice.)—But they pleaded that they might be allowed to act on, their principles, on their return from this country, as Americans—and without the imputation and suspicion of British influence—assuring us (and who can doubt the truth of it?) that such suspicion and imputation would materially impair, if not entirely destroy, the efficiency of their efforts." Again:—"It were a very false and slanderous conclusion, that a man is no abolitionist, because he does not approve of all the modes of abolition which have been adopted and prosecuted. It may be the very strength of his attachment to the cause of abolition that produces his repudiation of some of those modes; because to his judgment, be it right or wrong, they appear calculated to hinder rather than to expedite the desired consummation."—I have now, I believe, cited all the most material portions of this letter. My quotations have been made with a view of doing full justice to the anti-slavery sentiments of my endeared friend, and of expressing his strongest charges against myself, and others who have condemned the Alliance. Dr. Wardlaw has most explicitly declared, that he can hold no religious fellowship with a slaveholder, or with a man who maintains slavery; but he says, that "the American ministers who were here were anti-slavery men like ourselves," or, if he pleases, like himself. I will not, for a single instant, call in question the sincerity and perfect honesty of either of these declarations; but I will state a few facts, and leave Dr. Wardlaw to decide, as in the sight of God, and before the world, to which he has made his declarations, and in the presence of his Christian brethren in this kingdom, upon the course which, in reference to those facts, he felt bound to adopt. He says he cannot defile himself by clasping the hand of a slaveholder. The American delegates recorded a minute on the 28th of August, in which they declared their fixed and solemn resolution to "maintain intimate and affectionate relations with slaveholders." Will Dr. Wardlaw say that these men are "anti-slavery like ourselves." Again, Dr. Smythe, of Charleston, South Carolina, was a member of the Alliance, though *excluded* from the Irish Assembly, in his native town of Belfast. Will Dr. Wardlaw say, that Dr. Smythe was "anti-slavery like ourselves?" The Rev. Sidney E. Morse was a member of the Alliance. Will Dr. Wardlaw read that gentleman's letter in the *Witness* on the 8th July last, and say he is an anti-slavery man like ourselves? Let us come to the British members of the Alliance. Will Dr. Wardlaw read Sir Culling Eardly Smith's speech at Aylesbury, in which the Hon, Baronet says he would sooner resign his place in the Alliance, than relinquish communion with one of the members of that body, *who is a slaveholder*, and will Dr. Wardlaw then say that there was no slaveholder in the Alliance, and no defender of communion with slaveholders? Will Dr. Wardlaw read the speech of the Rev. Mr. Clowes, at Norwich, in which that gentleman says, that, "if his father had left him slaves, he would have kept them for their good;" and then tell us if such sentiments are his own. Will he read the letter of the Rev. Mr. Ewbank, in reply to his own, and tell us that there is no difference between himself and that member of the Alliance? But enough. My esteemed friend has written too much, unless he intends to write more. He has shut himself up, in my judgment, to withdraw from the Alliance. We shall hold him to his own words. We do not wish slavery to be denounced more strongly that he has denounced it; nor do we differ from him on the subject of religious communion with slaveholders. If he will act upon his own principles we are content. One word about the cry of "infidelity" raised against those who have opposed the doings of the Alliance and the Free Church, and I have done. I can truly say that I am not associated with a single individual of infidel sentiments; and that, least of all, are those infidels who have stood conspicuously forth with me in this warfare. But to those high professing Christians who are more active in circulating calumnies against abolitionists, than in reproving manstealers or in succouring the slave, I would say—"Go to the Word of God which you profess to revere, and you will find it thus written:—Romans ii. 24th to 29th verses —"The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written. For circumcision profiteth, if those keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore, if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, *if it fulfil the law*, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward, in the flesh. But he is a Jew, who is one inwardly; and circumcision, is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; *whose praise is not of men, but of God.* [Mr. Thompson concluded amidst great cheering.]

Mr. GARRISON, in an able speech, proposed the following resolution:—

Resolved,—"That this meeting assures the brutal enslavers of

the colonial population in the United States, that the people of Scotland will never sanction the present criminal connection of the Free Church with the slaveholding churches of America, nor give it any repose, so long as it refuses to 'SEND BACK THE MONEY,' which was so iniquitously obtained in the slaveholding States by its delegates; and that the conduct of the Evangelical Alliance, in submitting to be gagged on the subject of slavery at the dictation of the American delegates, has forfeited its claims to the confidence, respect, and support of the friends of God and man throughout the world."

Mr. THOMPSON, in seconding it, paid a most eloquent tribute of respect to the memory of the late Rev. Mr. M'Tear.

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously amidst great cheering.

Thanks having been voted to the Chairman, the meeting separated at twelve o'clock.

Bolton Free Press Nov. 28/46

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING.

On Thursday evening and last evening, public meetings were held in the Temperance Hall, on the question of American Slavery, when addresses on the subject were delivered by Mr. Frederick Douglas, the "fugitive" slave from the state of Maryland, and Mr. R. Smith, of London, who attended as a deputation from the Anti-Slavery League.

On Thursday evening the side seats in the body of the hall were well filled. There was a moderate attendance in the gallery, but the reserved seats were thinly occupied. In the absence of the Rev. James Garner, who was unavoidably prevented attending the meeting, Mr. Thomas Mulliner, was unanimously appointed chairman.

The Chairman after a few brief remarks on the subject of slavery, read the announcement convening the meeting, and called upon Mr. R. Smith, of London, to address the meeting.

Mr. SMITH came forward and was received with cheers. He spoke at some length, alluding to the formation of the Anti-Slavery League, the object of which was the overthrow of slavery in all lands, more especially in the United States of America, by the continued efforts of all classes of persons, irrespective of country, complexion, or religious creeds. He also alluded to the formation of the Evangelical alliance, a convention of which assembled in London about the time of the formation of the Anti-Slavery League, and which might be said to form a link in the movement of the league at the present time. It was known that about seventy Americans had come to attend the alliance as delegates, and that amongst them were slaveholders, and abettors, or apologists for slaveholding, and on the question being raised as to the discountenancing of slavery, it was, after much discussion, resolved that the question should be erased from their proceedings altogether:—in a word, that all movements respecting slavery be obliterated from the movements of the alliance. A public meeting was subsequently held in Exeter Hall, at which some four or five thousand persons were present, when addresses were delivered, and the proceedings of the alliance reviewed, and a resolution was moved and carried almost unanimously, to the effect that the alliance had proved itself to be recreant to the principles of Anti-Slavery. More recently, numerously attended meetings had been held in many large towns, where similar responses had been given to the appeals made to them on the subject. The objects of the Anti-Slavery League had already been agitated in some of the towns of Lancashire, where the meetings were unanimously of opinion with respect to the enormity of slave-dealing, and had come to resolutions to use their exertions for the overthrow of the system in the United States. He condemned the practice of slavery as existing in the United States, and countenanced by professing Christians, and urged the necessity of an expression of feeling of abhorrence on the part of the people of this country, of so wicked a system. He read a number of extracts of proceedings in religious conferences and assemblies in America, showing the approval of ministers of the gospel, who not only approved of but participated in slave dealing. It was true he observed, that Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodist-Episcopalians, Independents, and some other minor bodies professing christianity, were guilty of slaveholding, and some of them were steeped to the very lips in the practice; while others were abetters or apologists for the slave-dealing system. Nor could the system be said to be confined to the southern states for in the north it was countenanced by fraternising with its promoters in the south. A few years since at the annual meeting of the American and Foreign Bible Society it was resolved that in the space of one year the society would place in the hands of every family in the United States a copy of the scriptures. Now it was known by the abolitionists that in this boasted resolve it was never contemplated to include the slave, and the American Anti-Slavery Society sent a deputation to them offering 5000 dollars if they would include the slaves in the distribution, but they said this was not contemplated, and they declined the offer. (Shame.) It was unblushingly stated twelve months afterwards, that the object had been accomplished, while not a solitary slave had received a copy! The offer was renewed and again rejected, and at a subsequent meeting it was renewed with the same fate. After some allusions to the traffic carried on in some of the states, he observed that the Americans were sensitive as to what were the opinions of the public of Great Britain respecting their various measures, and if on one point more than another, it was on the question of slavery, and it was therefore most desirable that an unanimous declaration of opinion should be given by the British public on the subject. This country had already made a great sacrifice to testify to the world its sincerity of opinion against slavery by abolishing it in the West Indies, but in so doing comparatively few were set at liberty. It was true, 800,000 had been emancipated in one day, yet there were six times that number still suffering as slaves in the United States; as many in Brazil; 600,000 by the French; and some 600,000 more by the Spaniards, Portuguese and other smaller kingdoms and territories. After some further remarks he gave way to Mr. Douglass. The audience showed its approbation of the sentiments uttered by Mr. Smith, by repeated marks of applause.

Mr. DOUGLASS then came forward, and was welcomed by very strong marks of applause. He delivered a long, eloquent, and powerful appeal to the meeting on the subject which they were assembled, commanding the most serious attention of his hearers, who very loudly and repeatedly showed their approbation of the sentiments

he advanced in denouncing the slave-dealing practices. Our space, however, will not permit us to give more than a brief sketch of his address. He commenced by alluding to the general position of slavery in the United States. They would have heard that there were slave states and free states in America. There were 15 slave and 13 free states. Each state had a separate form of government of its own, under which it was competent to legislate on all local matters; the local legislatures had the power of creating or abolishing slavery. Over the whole of the states was the general government having powers to levy taxes, regulate commerce, &c., but it had no right to interfere with the existence of slavery as to its abolition. No one state could abolish an institution of another state; yet while this was perfectly true it was also true that the non-slaveholding states were to a great extent responsible for the existence of slavery in the slave-holding states, for while the United States government had no authority to abolish slavery, it upheld the system of maintaining slavery by physical force. If a slave attempted to slip his fetters he was liable to be prevented by force of arms under the laws of the general government, so that the nation virtually said to the slaves as they laboured and toiled from day to day—"toil on, toil on; suffer under the lash; and if you dare turn, as even the worm does—if you dare to raise your hand in defence of your own person—if you dare attempt to gain for yourselves your freedom, we will bring down upon you the united power of the nation and crush you into subjection;" the whole nation said in effect, "slave, be a slave or die!" He believed there were in the southern states about 300,000 slaveholders, and the number of slaves there were 3,000,000; there being about ten slaves to one slaveholder. Now it was contrary to reason to suppose that one man could hold ten slaves by his own power. Under the American constitution, therefore, as it now existed, there were persons who might say they were opposed to, and hated slavery, and would do anything to have it abolished, while by their conduct they said to the slaveholder, "if your slaves attempt to run away, we will catch them for you." (Hear, hear.) The United States as a nation at each returning election, confirmed the practice of slavery. He then proceeded to dwell upon what slavery is. The word had been again and again misapplied in this country by persons saying they were slaves because they had to work hard. Now working hard was not slavery; he had worked harder since he became free than he did when he was a slave, with the exception of six months of the time of his enslavement. He was not there to defend any kind of oppression: on the contrary we hated it. But the working men here who had termed themselves "slaves" were mistaken; they had homes—families—wives and children—they had a right to live—aye, and the right to die—they had the right to starve; and, indeed, it was something to have that right. (Laughter.) American slaves had, however, none of these rights; they were considered as "things;" they were marketable commodities; as chattels, they were bought in the market; they were ranked amongst the brutes. The slave was held as a mere sheep or swine—entirely for another's good: his intellect, his deathless spirit, his conscience, his moral perception, were all property in the hands of another. Such was slavery, as it existed in the American states, where, probably, it existed in worse forms than in any other part of the world. In Mahomedan countries the slave was emancipated the moment he became a Mahomedan; in Russia (as we understood) the slave was confined to the circle of his domestic relations; but in Christian, democratic, republican, refined, civilised America the marriage relation was not respected; there was no recognition of domestic arrangements with regard to the slave: the husband was torn from his wife, children from parents, and parents from children, without any reference whatever to their wishes in the case. His master decided what he must eat and drink, what he must speak, when he must speak, and to whom; when he must work, what at, and how; when he must go abroad, when he must return, when he must marry, whom he shall marry, how long that engagement should be binding, what should be the cause of its dissolution, what was right and what was wrong, what was virtue and what was vice, what was sacred and what profane! Was there a man in this country who would say that in any such sense as that he was a slave? Were any one to attempt such arrogance as to say he was, he would no doubt be laughed at. He further dwelt at considerable length on the cruelties to which the slave was subjected, and denounced the conduct, in reference to America, of such as professed Christianity and supported the system of slavery. He gave a heart-rending account of slavery as experienced and witnessed by himself, including the horrors of the flogging system, the auction sale of slaves, &c., by which the audience seemed deeply affected. He referred to some of the laws under which slaves live, which were of a most afflicting and cruel nature. He also alluded to the circumstance of the Americans being extremely fond of terms designating "liberty," &c., and drew, in striking colours, their inconsistency in upholding slavery. He urged the necessity of Englishmen bestirring themselves, by rationally expressing their views on the matter, which would certainly have its due weight on the other side the Atlantic, which was now only about 14 days' sail from this country. Much, he considered, might be done by the people of this country towards emancipating the slave; and that being done, he observed, "the blessings of those that are ready to perish shall be yours."

Mr. Smith moved a vote of thanks to the chairman.

Mr. Douglass seconded the motion, and referred, with great pleasure, to the labours of the society to which Mr. Mulliner belonged (the Society of Friends), on behalf of the slave.

The motion having been put and carried unanimously, the meeting separated.

Last evening the Hall was nearly filled by a respectable audience. Mr. Thomas Ormrod officiated as chairman, and accompanying him on the platform we noticed R. Heywood, Esq., C. J. Darbishire, Esq., Mr. Mulliner, Mr. I. Wright, &c.

Mr. Smith delivered an address, and was followed by Mr. Douglass, who again depicted, in powerful terms, the painful bondage of American slavery, and the inconsistent conduct of the Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, and other churches there, in sanctioning and upholding the system. He called upon the English churches to have no communion with churches countenancing and supporting man-stealing. He was loudly and repeatedly applauded in the course of his address.

Glasgow Argus Dec. 3. 1846

THE FREE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

We are glad to see that the Free Church, now that they are relieved from the presence of Messrs. George Thompson, Garrison, Douglass, and Wright, have not lost sight of the great question of which these gentlemen were the zealous, though not perhaps very mild apostles; and that in the absence of the irritation caused by them, an effort is to be made to direct public attention calmly and dispassionately to the subject. At the request of the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society, a series of lectures is to be delivered in Edinburgh on the "Sinfulness of Slavery," the "Admission of Slaveholders to the Communion Table," and the "Maintenance of Christian Fellowship with Slaveholding Churches." The Rev. Dr. Willis and the Rev. Mr. Macbeth of this city, and the Rev. Dr. Young of Perth, have been announced as amongst those who have consented to lecture; and it is likely, we hear, that their lectures will be repeated in Glasgow. We trust that they will be well attended, and productive of good. There will be no offence in their arguments or statements, or the manner in which they are conveyed; and those members of the Free Church who still adhere to the opinion that it is right to "keep the money," and who would not be persuaded by Mr. Thompson or Mr. H. C. Wright, if they spoke with the tongues of angels, will, at all events, listen with candour and impartiality to the remonstrances of gentlemen like these, who are known to be the sincere friends of the Free Church—two of them amongst its most distinguished ornaments.

Bristol Mercury April 3. 1847.

BRISTOL AUXILIARY ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.

On Thursday evening a meeting was held in the Public Rooms, Broadmead, as a mark of respect to Mr. Frederick Douglass, the champion of the anti-slavery cause, previously to his leaving this country. The room was crowded by a highly respectable auditory. The chair was taken by

Edward Thomas, Esq, who, after a few introductory remarks, said they were then met for the purpose of hearing the last address of Frederick Douglass, previously to his departure for America. Before calling on him to address the meeting it had been considered right to pass some resolutions expressive of the estimation in which he had been held in this country, and the good that had been effected through his instrumentality; as they would have a tendency to strengthen his hands on his arrival at the other side of the Atlantic. He was happy to inform them that Frederick Douglass now stood before them in a different character to that in which he unhappily appeared when he last addressed them. He was then a slave, but now he was a free man.—(Cheers.)—His freedom had been purchased by his friends in this country, without his solicitation, although under a protest that his master had no moral right to claim him as his property.—(Hear, hear.)—He was now about to return to his native shores, and although it was a dangerous experiment, in consequence of the prejudice which existed against the coloured population by those of their white brethren, yet he was willing to run the risk for the purpose of furthering the objects of the anti-slavery cause. On his arrival there he proposed to open a coloured printing press, and an opportunity would be afforded those present to assist him in the work.

Dr. Estlin moved the first of the resolutions alluded to by the Chairman, expressive of the cordial welcome Mr. Douglass had received in this country. He was anxious to impress the fact on the meeting that they were not met merely for the purpose of entertainment, but to discharge a very important duty which they owed to their respected friend. That was the last occasion they would have of expressing their respect to Mr. Douglass; and what took place at that meeting would be disseminated far and wide through the United States of America. He knew the result of that meeting would give great support to the abolitionists in Boston, who gave their time, their interests, and their reputation in this great cause. He, therefore, trusted all would heartily respond to the resolutions which had been drawn up. All who had seen the course pursued by Mr. Douglass would feel proud in giving vent to the pleasure they had experienced while listening to his interesting addresses. With Mr. Douglas's oratorical powers he might have returned to the United States laden with riches, but that was not his object. When asked his charge for attending a meeting, his answer was, only his travelling expenses. He had heard a ridiculous report that Mr. Douglass left Bristol with 1000*l.* on his last visit; he might have taken a thousand hearts with him, for it was impossible to hear him without feeling an interest in his welfare. He hoped all would on this occasion do what they possibly could to assist him in establishing a printing press in the United States for the dissemination of truth, and to assist the anti-slavery cause.

Robert Norris, Esq., seconded the resolution, which was carried amidst enthusiastic cheering.

Joseph Fry, Esq., moved the second resolution, offering Mr. Douglass their cordial co-operation, and expressing the gratification they felt at his being no longer a slave; which having been seconded, was also carried amidst loud applause.

J. C. Neild, Esq., moved the third resolution, to the effect that it was the earnest prayer of the meeting that Mr. Douglass may be saved from the peril of the seas, so that on his arrival on the other side of the Atlantic he might raise his voice against slavery, and, in conjunction with other friends of the anti-slavery cause, might introduce measures which would finally result in the emancipation of every slave in America.

Mr. Chapman had great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

The Chairman having put the motion to the meeting, it was carried unanimously.

Mr. Frederick Douglass rose amidst much cheering. He said that one of the greatest impediments in the way of the cause of emancipation was the prejudice that existed in America of the white population against their coloured brethren. The same feeling prevailed in the non-slaveholding States as in those which professed to be slaveholding States; indeed, the more intelligent, the more upright, the more highly cultivated the negro, the deeper, the more intense the hatred with which they were regarded in that country. That evil met the coloured man every where; he found it in the hotel, and met with it at the communion table; it was even carried to the grave; the bones of the black man were not permitted to lay in proximity with those of the white man. But it was not altogether against the colour that the white men objected to after all; they assume that the God of Love had created in their bosoms a natural, a strong, and a deep aversion to the coloured population; that there existed an impassable barrier between them; the black man could not live in a state of freedom; the liberty of the black man was incompatible with the liberty of the white man; while the slave remained in bondage no one thought of disregarding him; while he was a slave his master did not object for him to drive him from one place to another in that capacity; his mistress, also, who was a woman possessed of a great degree of susceptibility, would frequently ride beside

him in a carriage, as all who saw them would know he was a slave. In the United States wherever they see a coloured man free they despise him, but if in his chains it is quite the reverse; consequently, it was not altogether the colour which created such a prejudice. If a slave attempted to rise from that condition to a man, from a chattel to a human being, then the public scorn is upon him, to crush him back into the state from which he attempted to rise, which was almost as unbearable as slavery itself. Every white man in the United States felt at perfect liberty to kick, beat, or in any other manner to illuse his coloured brother; all the States but the State of New England acted on this principle; so that wherever slaves make their appearance they feel that society is looking upon them as inferior beings; if the children of black parents are sent to school, or to learn any handicraft, they are repulsed, and jested at by the other children. In New York, which is a free State, a coloured man is not allowed to drive his own horse and cart; in no part of America was he permitted to be a citizen, except in Massachusetts; in all their railroad trains, stage coaches, steam-boats, and indeed every other public conveyance, the black man was considered to be inferior; in travelling by railway they were obliged to have a carriage to themselves, for which they paid the same price as others, but the accommodation was of a very inferior description; in the steam-boats, instead of being allowed to take a place in the first cabin, they were told to consider themselves highly honoured to be allowed to remain in the second; he had often been driven from the quarter-deck down among the horses, in consequence of not having skin the same colour as Englishmen. If remonstrated with on the subject, they ask, "Would you have the negro placed on an equal footing with us?" and should the answer be in the affirmative, the man is denounced as an incendiary, a fanatic, one who would turn white into black, and black into white. So strong is this feeling in the United States, that no coloured man is allowed by Government to carry the mail bags from one post-office to another; not because he is not trustworthy, for testimonials of their honesty and good behaviour were constantly wrung from their masters. Then, why are they not allowed to carry the mail bags? Because it is the wish to impress the negro with the idea that the Government does not consider him to be a man, and then make that a pretext for hating him; the black man is told that he is morally and intellectually beneath the white man, and therefore it was of no use to endeavour to educate him; seventeen millions of the white population in America planted their heels upon the breasts of their black brethren, and when called on to desist, they say, the negro is beneath us, and we must keep him so. The speaker instanced a number of cases that had come under his knowledge, where cruelty had been practised by the slave-holders on their slaves. He then said there were seventy-one crimes punishable with death in the United States, if perpetrated by a coloured man, and only one if committed by a white man. One reason they assigned for making slaves of the negroes was that they were inferior; allowing that to be the case, he could not discover anything in the Old or New Testament whereby they should be crushed. In his bible he read that those who were lame were healed,—the blind were restored to sight,—the weak were instructed,—and when a feast was prepared the poor and needy were invited. Now he thought the blacks were those characters, therefore they should be taken by the hand; instead of this they make use of the black man's ignorance to keep them in slavery and bondage. He had then been in this country nineteen months, and had delivered nearly 300 addresses in the United Kingdom; he had travelled by all means of conveyance, and in every instance had been treated with the greatest kindness and often deference by those with whom he had come in contact; and had never met with one who had indicated the slightest dislike to him on account of his colour.—(Cheers.)—He would go back and tell the people in America that fact, that however much they disregarded him there, in England he was regarded as a man; however much they despised him, here he was received as a man and a brother.—(Cheers.)—This fact he would also tell them that liberty, under all circumstances, was far preferable to the yokes of bondage, with which he formerly was goaded; and they could not but feel it the more coming from him, as he had felt, and that severely, the horrors of slavery in America, and could bear testimony to the pleasures of liberty in England; and he confidently hoped that he should see the day when slavery would be abolished from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and eventually from the United States. He was much struck while in London some time since by the conduct of some American ministers, he alluded to the Rev. Dr. Cox, the Rev. Mr. Kirk, and the Rev. Mr. Marsh; they saw that Englishmen did not refrain to give him their hands, nor did they turn up their noses at him, as those gentlemen had previously done in America; he could not refrain from laughing at the manner in which they approached him; they thought they must do as others did now that they were in England, and at length those very men who in America would not have touched him with a pair of tongues, actually held out their hands to shake hands with him. He could truly say that of all lands to him England was most dear. Nothing should induce him to conceal a single fact of the treatment he had received in this country; he wished he could say anything in favour of America; certainly she had many things to make her proud, her noble rivers, her forests, her glens, but while he remembered that those noble forests were inhabited by men and women who had escaped from bondage, sleeping in caves and hollows, rather than be under the iron hand of their professed Christian masters, he could not speak well of the country. The prejudice he had before alluded to might be observed among the religious bodies in the United States; in the Wesleyan and Baptist societies he had known coloured people dragged away from joining in church fellowship with the white members. In fact, in nearly all the religious bodies it was the same, except among the Roman Catholics; among them there was no distinction, all bowed before a common Saviour alike; but in Protestant and Evangelical churches a negro is dragged from the communion table, and is obliged to remain till the white men are gone; and then he is admitted, the official saying that God is no respecter of persons. Such doings had often been the means of driving many into infidel halls, and to imbibe the opinions therein promulgated. The speaker continued a long and interesting address amidst loud cheers, frequently rendering his voice inaudible, and concluded by expressing his sincere thanks to the inhabitants of Bristol for the reception they had given him.

Votes of thanks to Mr. Douglass and the Chairman terminated the proceedings.

Liverpool Mercury May 21/47.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

We are glad to observe that this worthy man has arrived safely in the United States, and has met with a hearty reception at Lynn. His "lonely" passage is thus described in a letter to Mr. Lloyd Garrison:—

"My passage was not the most agreeable; for, aside from the head winds, a rough sea, and the innumerable perils of the deep, I had the cruel and almost omnipotent and omnipresent spirit of American slavery with which to contend.

"After an interesting tour of twenty months through the British isles,—during which I made use of all the various means of conveyance, by land and sea, from town to town, and city to city, my feelings as a man, and my rights as a passenger, sacredly regarded, and never being able to detect the slightest dislike to me on account of my colour,—I bid farewell to monarchical England, and look toward democratic America; and while yet three thousand miles away from her shores, at the first step, I am smitten with the pestilential breath of her slave system! I came home a proscribed man; and this, solely to propitiate American pro-slavery hate. The American public demanded my exclusion from the saloon of the steam-ship and the company owning the steamer had not the virtue to resist the demand. The dominion of slavery is no longer confined under the star-spangled banner, but extends itself, and bears sway, even under that of Great Britain. But, without further preface, I will at once put you in possession of the facts in the case."

Mr. Douglass then describes the circumstances attendant on his taking a cabin passage by the Cambria, in London, and the dispute between him and the agents in

Liverpool, circumstances with which the public are already familiar. Instead of going over the same ground again, it will be sufficient to remind the reader that Mr. Douglass attributes his exclusion from the cabin and saloon solely to his colour, whilst Mr. M'Iver, in his published letter, declares that it was owing to occurrences on board during a previous passage, and says, "I told him I should have taken the same course, had his name been John Jones or any thing else, instead of Frederick Douglass, or had he been the whitest man in the world," whilst Mr. Cunard himself has said, "No one can regret more than I do the unfortunate circumstances respecting Mr. Douglass's passage, but I can assure you that nothing of the kind will again take place in the steam-ships with which I am connected."

Mr. Douglass concludes as follows:—"Subject to this restriction, I must never enter the saloon,—the part of the ship the most commodious, and where other passengers took their meals. I must eat alone—sleep alone—*be alone*. These were my limits on board the British steam-ship Cambria. By this regulation, I was not only deprived of the privilege of eating in the saloon, but also shut out from religious worship. We had two Sundays during the voyage, and, in conformity to the religious ideas of the company, as well as of the British public, had regular religious services performed on board. They called upon '*Our Father*,' the Creator of the heavens and the earth—the God who has made of one blood all nations, *the black as well as the white*—to bless them—while they cursed and excluded me on account of the colour of my skin. This, I thought, was American slaveholding religion, *under British colours*, and I felt myself no great loser by being excluded from its benefits. Aside from this proscription, I was as well provided for as any other passenger. Indeed, my apartments were much to be preferred to any which I saw on board. I was treated with the utmost politeness by every officer on board, and received every attention from the servants during the whole voyage. It may be asked, then, why do I yet complain? The answer is, that my position was one of coercion, when it ought to have been that of option. The difference is as wide as that of freedom and slavery; and the man who cannot see the one, cannot see the other."

T WESTERN ADVERTISE

Public Notices.

BRISTOL ACADEMY FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE FINE ARTS.

THE SECOND ANNUAL EXHIBITION of the WORKS of LIVING ARTISTS, will be Opened to the Public on WEDNESDAY next, the 26th instant, at the BRISTOL INSTITUTION, PARK-STREET.

Open from Ten till dusk. Admission One Shilling. Catalogue Sixpence. Season Tickets, 2s. 6d. each.

7097. JEREMIAH HILL, Honorary Secretary.

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

A MEETING will be held on TUESDAY next, August 25th, at the VICTORIA ROOMS, when WM. LLOYD GAINSON, Esq., President of the "American Anti-Slavery Society," and FREDERICK DOUGLASS, the Fugitive Slave from Maryland, will adress the Audience upon Slavery in the United States, and will explain in what manner Great Britain may sympathize with, and aid, the cause of Abolition.

The Right Worshipful J. K. HABERFIELD, Esq., MAYOR OF BRISTOL, has kindly consented to preside on the occasion.

Doors to open at One o Clock' the Chair to be taken at Two o'Clock precisely.

For the purpose of defraying incidental expense in time of Room, &c., a Collection will be made at the doors after the meeting.

It is intended for an Evening Meeting to be held in Bristol on the following day; notice of which will be given in Handbills, and may be obtained at Mr. H. C. Evans's, Clare Street, or Mr. Ackland's Dolphin Street.

7093

ER AND CHRONICLE, A

WOOL MARKET.

LEEDS, Aug. 14.

There has not been any variation in the sales of English comb ing or clothing wools during the present week, and prices remain firm, at last week's quotations.

LIVERPOOL, Aug. 15.

There has only been a moderate demand for laid Highland wool this week, at scarcely late rates. White Highland has been rather more inquired for. There has been nothing doing in either crossed or Cheviot.

PRICE OF METALS.

			£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
IRON—Bar *a*	Wales	ton	8	5	0	to	8	10	0
,,	London ..	..	9	5	0		9	10	0
Nail rods	,, ...	..	0	0	0		10	5	0
Hoop (Staf.)	,, ...	..	11	5	0		11	10	0
Sheet	,, ,, ...	..	0	0	0		13	0	0
Bars	,, ,, ...	..	0	0	0		11	0	0
Rails		..	9	10	0		9	15	0
Welsh cold-blast foundry pig		..	4	5	0		5	0	0
Scotch Pig *b*, Clyde	..	..	0	0	0		3	15	0
Russian *c*, CCND ..	..	..	15	0	0		15	10	0
,, PSI.	..	..	0	0	0		0	0	0
,, Gourieff	..	..	14	5	0		14	10	0
,, Archangel	..	..	13	10	0		13	12	0
Swedish *d*, on the spot	..	..	11	0	0		11	10	0
,, Steel, fagt.	..	..	0	0	0		15	5	0
,, ,, kegs *e*	..	..	14	0	0		14	5	0
COPPER—Tile *f* ..	.. ..	..	0	0	0		92	0	0
Tough Cake ..	..	..	0	0	0		93	0	0
Best selected ..	..	..	0	0	0		96	0	0
Ordinary sheets	..	lb.	0	0	0		0	0	10¼

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08714 755 7